In compliance with the
Canadian Privacy Legislation
some supporting forms
may have been removed from
this dissertation.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count,
their removal does not represent
any loss of content from the dissertation.

University of Alberta

Functions of Woland in M. Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*

by

Peter Georges Larson

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2003

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisisitons et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87579-2
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87579-2

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Peter Georges Larson

Title of Thesis: Functions of Woland in M. Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

28 August 2003

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Functions of Woland in M. Bulgakov's* The Master and Margarita submitted by Peter Georges Larson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Dr. Peter A. Rolland

Dr. Jelena Anatolievna Pogosjan

Dr. Elena Siemens

Dr. Rolf Hellebust

22 August 2003

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the narrative and dialogic functions of Woland in Mixail Bulgakov's novel *Master i Margarita* using methods of analysis developed by Mixail Baxtin. Bulgakov's novel is a complex and multi-faceted structure, of which Woland is the central, unifying character. Understanding Woland and how he influences the novel is essential for a richer and more accurate view of Bulgakov's work. Baxtin developed a method of analyzing the attitude and significance of a character based on that character's field of valuation, position relative to the author, narrator and other characters, and method of conducting dialogue. Several chapters and dialogues of *Master i Margarita* are the subjects of a detailed analysis. The author of the thesis also explores a prominent subtext connected to Dostoevskij.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thankfulness to my supervisors, Dr. Peter Rolland and Dr. Jelena Anatolievna Pogosjan, who have helped me develop my potential and provided a great deal of knowledge and encouragement. I would also like to thank Dr. Elena Siemens for her help.

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my parents, James and Denise Larson, for their support and patience, without which I could not have come this far.

Я хочу щиро подякувати Оксані Миколаївні Тростинській. Вона своєю великою мудрістю та вірою дала мені натхнення виконати цю роботу і надала напрямок моєму життю, від якого я отримую стільки щастя і завдяки чому я стаю кращою людиною.

CONTENTS

1. General Introduction 1
   - 1.1 Hypothesis 1
   - 1.2 Literature Survey 4
   - 1.3 Methodology and Structure 7

2. The Figure of the Narrator in *Master i Margarita* Using the Theoretical Framework of M. Baxtin: An Analysis by Chapter 10
   - 2.1 Introduction: Points of View and Valuation in Narrative 10
   - 2.2 Chapter 1: "Никогда не разговаривайте с неизвестными" 14
   - 2.3 Chapter 2: "Понтий Пилат" 17
   - 2.4 Chapter 3: "Погоня" 22
   - 2.5 The Epilogue of *Master i Margarita* 27
   - 2.6 Conclusions to the Chapter 28

3. Strategies of Dialogue according to M. M. Baxtin 32
   - 3.1 Introduction 32
   - 3.2 Chapter 22: "При свечах" 32
   - 3.3 Chapter 24: "Извлечение мастера" 40
   - 3.4 Chapter 29: "Судьба мастера и Маргариты определена" 44
   - 3.5 Conclusions to the Chapter 50

4. Dialogue with the Devil through Baxtin's Interpretation in the Works of Dostoevskij and Bulgakov 51
   - 4.1 Introduction: Dialogue with the Devil in Literary Tradition 51
   - 4.2 Dialogue with the Devil in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* and *Master i Margarita* 52
   - 4.3 Woland's Rheumatism 57
   - 4.4 Korov'ev and Korovkin 64
   - 4.5 Conclusions to the Chapter 72

5. Conclusion 74

6. Bibliography 79

1. General Introduction

1.1 Hypothesis

The structure of a text must be understood in order to gain a better understanding of the subject matter of that text. The structure of a novel is made up of factors including from whose point of view the action is narrated, whom the narrator follows, how the *sjužet* is constructed, how time and space are constructed. These features, which exist under the immediately visible surface of the narration, provide subtle but important information about features of the novel, including the positions that characters and narrators occupy.

Mixail Baxtin formulates a view of the narrative structure of a novel by visualizing concentric spheres. The author forms the largest sphere because the author has access to all possible information. Usually the second largest sphere is that of the narrator. Such is the case in the works of Dostoevskij. According to Baxtin, the narrators of Dostoevskij's novels generally have the second greatest amount of information, following the author. Finally there are the spheres of the individual characters that have varying measures of information and interact with one another.

Bulgakov's novel *Master i Margarita* encounters the same problems but solves them in a different way. The structure of the spheres is applicable to any novel, but in *Master i Margarita* one of the characters, Woland, actually has a larger sphere of knowledge than does the narrator, who is on a level with the other characters. Whereas in Dostoevskij's novels the viewpoints of the author and the narrator may coincide, in *Master i Margarita* they very demonstrably diverge.

The narrator of *Master i Margarita* is much more intrusive and varied in comparison with many of Dostoevskij's narrators. In general, Dostoevskij's narrators can be said to be more reliable. There are different narrators in *Master i Margarita*: the regular narrator, Woland, and the Master. The regular narrator never narrates the events that take place in Eršalaim — that is left for Woland and the Master. The Master also narrates the story of his

life before meeting Ivan Bezdomnyj. At those times the regular narrator displays no formal characteristics of being.

In all other parts of the novel the narrator does exist, but he is not reliable. He is at times naïve and his value statements are only subjective. The narrator at times takes on the values and viewpoints of other characters in the novel.

Woland clearly maintains a privileged position in *Master i Margarita*. He is the only being in the novel who can be said to be truly omniscient, a trait that even Iešua does not possess. Woland's power in the events of the novel is reflected in the structure of the novel as well. Woland has the power to silence the other narrator. He controls the access of the other characters to information, gradually leading Ivan Bezdomnyj to a realization of his real identity. Woland also has power over the time and space of the novel. When Woland tells the Eršalaim story, Berlioz and Bezdomnyj loose all sense of time. During the ball the time is held at midnight in the *sjužet* for what is several hours in the *fabula*.

There are two manifestations of Woland: interlocutor and narrator. There is a latent connection between the two manifestations. Both emphasize Woland's position in the novel and both drive the themes developed in the novel to completion.

Woland as narrator and Woland as interlocutor maintain a latent connection in that they use different strategies on different levels in pursuing a unified course. Woland's use of dialogue is a unifying factor throughout the entire novel.

The first dialogic opposition is Woland and his 'department' contrasted with Iešua and his 'department.' They work together, but separately. The second opposition, between Woland and his non-materialistic truths and a humanity that has embraced materialism, is not symbiotic. Berlioz and the literary establishment of MASSOLIT embody this side. The two sides of existence, Woland and Iešua, never successfully engage in mutual dialogue. Iešua never appears with Woland. Iešua's follower Levij Matvej does engage in dialogue with Woland, but that dialogue cannot be considered successful

because, as Woland observes, they are 'speaking different languages' even though they discuss the same things (Bulgakov 1990, 350). The human interlocutors fall into two groups: those who are able to successfully engage in dialogue with Woland, and those who are not. Those who cannot successfully engage in dialogue with Woland are destroyed, while those who do, benefit. Woland advances his teaching on the inadequacy of materialism and the lack of control of humanity over its own fate through dialogues.

Unlike the polyphonic heroes of Dostoevskij, Woland, as narrator in the Eršalaim section understands the interior monologues of other characters even though he does not echo them in dialogic fashion. In his dialogues, Woland advances his thesis on the inadequacy of materialism as a philosophy and humanity's lack of control over its own fate. Even though Woland is not seen in an active role in the Eršalaim chapters, he is never far from the *sjužet* contained therein. Firstly, he claims to have been physically present at all the events in Eršalaim. As the most reliable narrator it is necessary to believe him. Secondly, he himself narrates the first installment of the Eršalaim story, and the themes of Iešua's dialogues are introduced and handled by Woland in the preceding chapters. Like the underlying structure of the novel as a whole, Woland's persona encompasses the whole of *Master i Margarita*. Understanding Woland's strategy of narration will help in understanding how he unifies the novel. Woland's appearance in Moscow is precipitated by the fact that humanity there no longer celebrates Easter. Woland arrives to investigate what has happened. Upon arrival he begins 'preaching' or instructing Berlioz and Bezdomnyj in the truth of humanity's place in the universe. Woland enters into dialogue with Berlioz and Bezdomnyj, and finally, with Margarita and the Master.

The narrative structure of a novel is a unique framework, the study of which holds the key to understanding covert rules and conventions in the context of that novel. Bulgakov's novel is especially demanding of such an approach because of the multi-layered and confusing nature of the structure as well as the way Bulgakov co-opts and redefines many traditional tropes. *Master i Margarita* is confusing partly because of a seeming lack of unity.

This extends to a lack of a unified narrator or narrative style. I suggest that the novel is unified in a way that has not been demonstrated by criticism to date. The unifying element is Woland and a moral-valuational orientation that supports him. Physically Woland is the only possible unifying presence — he is the only character, including the narrator, present in all three subplots of the novel: Woland and his suite's exploits in Moscow, the Eršalaim story, and the story of Margarita and the Master. Woland embodies a conception of moral justice based on recognition of a higher plane of reality and a rejection of pure materialism in favor of Bulgakov's vision of artistic and spiritual truth. These themes pervade the entire novel.

1.2 Literature Survey

The works selected for attention in this literature survey represent a short list of works that specifically deal with dialogue in *Master i Margarita*. This survey represents a list of the most recent works that specifically deal with dialogue in *Master i Margarita*. They also stand in a long line of criticism relating to *Master i Margarita*.

Vida Taranovski Johnson's study "The Thematic Function of the Narrator in *The Master and Margarita*" (1981) is devoted to defining the different narrators and their roles in the novel. Johnson identifies three distinct narrators who fulfill the function of the regular narrator, and also describes the character narrators: Woland and the Master. She briefly examines the style of Woland's narration of Chapter Two of the novel, and compares that with the other presentations of the Eršalaim story, i.e. those related by the Master and Ivan Bezdomnyj. The narrative style of the Eršalaim sections is compared with that of the Moscow sections. The Serbian-American scholar finds a large difference in narrative styles, which leads her to conclude that the narrators are different.

The main focus of Johnson's article is not to examine Woland as a narrator or to assess the style of the Eršalaim story in depth, but rather to quantify the three manifestations of the regular narrator. Johnson claims

that the regular narrator is authorial and that he uses irony to purposefully satirize the people and institutions of the Moscow chapters.

It may be impossible to definitively know if the narrator feigns ignorance to satirize Moscow life or if he truly is ignorant and the author arranges the satirical elements without causing the narrator to understand the thrust of his barbs. Because there are no formal indicators that the narrator is informed and only pretends to be uninformed, I operate from the conclusion that the narrator is in actuality uninformed. I also proceed from the idea that it is impossible to determine if there are different voices belonging to the same narrator or if there are only different appearances of the same narrator. I posit that there is only one, albeit non-unified narrator, because there is no formal evidence to the contrary.

Vida Taranovski Johnson's study is very useful for understanding the various narrative styles of the novel, which are markedly different. There are very few published studies given over to an examination of the narrator and narrative styles of *Master i Margarita*, so Johnson's work is almost unique in this regard.

The other study that is directly relevant to my work is Harold D. Baker's article "Socratic, Hermetic, and Internally Convincing Dialogue: Types of Interlocution in Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*" (1998). Baker's study is concerned with what he identifies as the two types of dialogue (Socratic and Hermetic) in the novel. The strategy of dialogue that Baker identifies Woland using with many of the characters, such as Berlioz and Bezdomnyj, is Socratic dialogue.

In my view, Socratic dialogue is a means for a stronger interlocutor to lead a weaker one to truth through a series of questions that push the weaker partner towards a specific outcome. Such a strategy assumes by its nature that the strong interlocutor, or guide, is assumed to possess 'truth' and to control the weaker. This paradigm is consistent with my own observations of Woland's dialogues with most of the Moscow characters, especially with Berlioz and Bezdomnyj. My thesis embraces the inference

that Woland is at all times the stronger interlocutor and that he does possess an absolute truth.

The second strategy of dialogue that Baker identifies is Hermetic dialogue. This strategy is based on information that both interlocutors possess, which forms the basis for the transmission of meaning. Hermetic dialogue can be confusing and contradictory to the uninitiated, who does not have the base information common to both interlocutors, because Hermetic dialogue is often overtly contradictory and its meanings are cloaked in context and innuendo. Baker provides the example of the conversation between Pontius Pilate and Afranij, in which overtly the procurator tries to 'save' Judas Iscariot, but in reality orders Afranij himself to kill Judas. The reader does not understand this order until Pilate later admits to Levij Matvej that he himself ordered that Judas be killed.

The chapter where Pilate gives the order, Chapter 25, is entitled "Как прокуратор пытался спасти Иуду из Кириафа." In my view this name suggests that the narrator himself was misled by Pilate's Hermetic dialogue with Afranij. Although Johnson's assertion that the narrator does know what is really happening and intentionally applies irony is possible, there is no formal evidence to support her contention.

I further suggest that Woland's dialogues with Margarita as well as Woland's dialogue with Azazello in Chapter 29, "Судьба мастера и Маргариты определена" are also Hermetic dialogues. Margarita learns the subtext necessary for engaging in Hermetic dialogue with Woland and uses communicating with that subtext to her advantage. By contrast, Berlioz cannot even successfully engage in a Socratic dialogue with Woland, and so Woland must provide the irrevocable 'proof,' which is Berlioz's death, because of Berlioz's inability to understand.

An examination of the dialogue between traditional conceptions of 'good' and 'evil' is the subject of L. F. Kiseleva's study "Dialog dobra i zla v romane Bulgakova 'Master i Margarita'" (1991). Kiseleva identifies a "permeating hidden dialogue" [*сквозной скрытый диалог*] between Woland and Iešua (3).

Kiseleva observes the development of the "permeating hidden dialogue" from its inception in the first chapter throughout the space of the text. The dialogue between Woland and Iešua is not hostile but rather philosophically different. Woland is a source both of temptation and punishment — he punishes evil. The source of evil in the novel comes not from the devil but from greedy human beings. Kiseleva points out: "...Воланд, как и его поступки, оспариваются Иешуа, его представлениями о людях..." (Kiseleva 1991, 7). Kiseleva cites that Iešua believes all people are good, that there are no evil people on earth and believes that one day a kingdom of truth will appear on earth (Kiseleva 1991, 7). Using Baxtinian terminology, Kiseleva points out that Iešua and Woland deal with the same issues, but their methods are quite different:

> ...реплики и реакции каждого на одни и те же или близкие события и явления настолько далеко отстоят друг от друга, что внешние следы этого виртуозного диалога как бы исчезают, теряются в перипетиях сюжета. (Киселева 1991, 8)

The remainder of the article describes how the dialogues that Iešua and Woland conduct are on the same themes and have the same conclusions, and how the methods differ, even though they work for the same goal: the moral conduct and avoidance of excessive materialism of human beings.

1.3 Methodology and Structure

The purpose of this work is twofold. Firstly, I will examine Woland as one of the narrators of the novel. I will examine to what degree the inclusion of several narrators of different statuses is connected with the general conception of the novel. Secondly, I will examine dialogue within the novel, specifically the most important dialogues in which Woland is a participant.

The regular narrator, who describes the action in the Moscow sections, is not reliable or omniscient. The author even treats the narrator with irony because of the narrator's naïveté concerning the events of the novel and their meaning. The narrator simply cannot understand things that the author makes apparent to the reader. Woland, however, is omniscient and reliable,

and Bulgakov uses him to guide the readers as well as certain other characters through the complex meanings of his work.

The theoretical basis and methodology of this study is adapted from M. Baxtin's "Avtor i geroj v èstetičeskoj dejatel'nosti" (1986) and *Problemy poètiki Dostoevskogo* (1963).

Harold Baker (1998) uses Baxtin as a tool in explaining certain aspects of dialogue in *Master i Margarita*. In Baker's work Baxtin is used to explain the conflict between good and evil on the level of the action of *Master i Margarita*. Baxtin is not applied to the overt dialogues between characters but rather to dialogues on the larger level.

In Chapter One I will employ Baxtinian methods of understanding position and dialogue to examining the narrators of *Master i Margarita*, examining three chapters of special significance for the narration. Section 1.1 will study Baxtin's approach to the examination of the narrator and the narrator's position. Section 1.2 will study Chapter One of *Master i Margarita* in which Woland first appears and conducts his first and one of the most important dialogues of the novel, which sets the theme for the rest of action. Section 1.3 of my thesis will examine Woland as a narrator himself. I will examine differences in intuition and interpretation. Studying Woland as a narrator is the only means of better understanding this character's nature and internal thought process. It is the closest a reader can come to 'seeing inside Woland's head.' Section 1.4 of my thesis will study Chapter Three of *Master i Margarita,* in which the narrator, along with Ivan Bezdomnyj further develops an understanding of Woland in particular and the events of the novel in general. Section 1.5 will be a brief analysis of the Epilogue to *Master i Margarita*. This section will demonstrate how the narrator has not finally learned how to interpret Woland and his visit to Moscow. This is the most prominent place in which the author treats the narrator with irony and underscores the narrator's deficiency of information in comparison to Woland.

Chapter Two of my thesis will examine Woland as an interlocutor in dialogue. This study will be based on Baxtin's study of dialogue in

Dostoevskij's novels in *Problemy poètiki Dostoevskogo*, the book where Baxtin develops his theory of the polyphonic novel (2.1). I will examine two of the most important dialogues with Woland, which occur with Margarita as the other interlocutor. Section 2.2 will study the dialogue between Woland and Margarita in Chapter 22, "При свечах," and section 2.3 will examine the dialogue between Woland and Margarita in Chapter 24, "Извлечение мастера." I will focus on Woland's position relative to Margarita and the other characters and on the strategies that Woland employs in dialogue with Margarita and how those strategies differ from Woland's dialogues with other characters, beause it is here the the fate of the main protagonists is decided..

Chapter Three will examine dialogue with the devil in Russian literary tradition, in the context of works that are best applied to Bulgakov (3.1). Section 3.2 will analyze the similarities and differences between Ivan Karamozov's dialogue with the devil from Dostoevskij's novel *Bratja Karamazovy* and two important dialogues of Margarita with Woland, in Chapters 22 and 24. In Baxtin's book *Problemy poètiki Dostoevskogo* the conversation with the devil in *Bratja Karamazov* occupies a small but important place. This conversation is an instance in which the devil acts as the Other, reproducing the interior dialogue of Ivan Karamazov and using that internal dialogue in an attempt to persuade Ivan Karamazov of his own guilt. Examining this section of Baxtin's work is important for several reasons. Firstly, Baxtin uses this dialogue to illustrate his theories of polyphony. Secondly, this scene must have been well-known to Bulgakov and would influence how he used the devil as a representation of the Other.

I believe that the scene mentioned above influenced Bulgakov's use of the devil as the Other in *Master i Margarita*. An important feature of my work is the establishment of the connection between Dostoevskij and *Master i Margarita*. Expanding upon the establishment of connection, it becomes apparent that Bulgakov's text engages Dostoevskij's in a dialogue about the nature of the devil and his function as an interlocutor with human beings faced with moral and ontological questions. The devils of Bulgakov and

Dostoevskij are similar in both form and content.

2. The Figure of the Narrator in Master i Margarita Using the Theoretical Framework of M. Baxtin: An Analysis by Chapter

2.1 Points of View and Valuation in Narrative

An analysis of the structure of the narration is useful in determining the relative attitudinal relationships between characters, and of the narrator towards the characters. In the work "Avtor i geroj v èstetičeskoj dejatel'nosti" Baxtin states:

> Вненаходимость — необходимое условие для сведения к единому формально-эстетическому ценностному контексту различных контекстов, образующихся вокруг нескольких героев... (Бахтин 1986, 8)

The existence of 'value contexts' is the foundation for triangulation on a character's position in the attitudes of the author, the narrator and the other characters. In Baxtin's formulation, each entity has its own circle, or field of values that are expressed in statements with polarities of opinion. In order to illustrate this structure, Baxtin uses Aleksandr Puškin's poem "Razluka." In that poem the lyric hero, who articulates the poem, describes his interactions with a woman. In this poem are three people:

> Единство лирического целого восстановляется тем, что ценностный контекст героини в его целом объемлется и утверждается контекстом героя, приобщается ему, как момент его, и оба эти контекста в свою очередь объемлются единым формальным — собственно эстетическим — ценностно-утверждающим активным контекстом автора и читателя. (Бахтин 1986, 8)

In this context, because the hero is also the narrator, all descriptions of the heroine, all reports of her speech and all value descriptions of things and circumstances relating to her must pass through the filter of the hero's point of view. At the same time, the hero is contained within the work of the author, which relays the information to the reader. The author and the reader do not exist in the field of the work, but rather the work exists in relation to the author and reader. Therefore the author and the reader form one sphere, containing the observations of the hero, containing the observations of the heroine.

The hero of "Razluka" is distinct from the heroine, but in describing the heroine's state and actions, the information comes through the hero's point of view, altering the way in which the heroine's field of valuation is represented:

> В нашей пьесе все конкретные моменты архитектонического целого стягиваются к двум ценностным центрам — героя и героини, причем первый круг объемлет второй, шире его, и оба они равно объемлются — как единое событие — формирующею активностью автора-читателя; таким образом, оказываются три взаимопроникающих ценностных контекста, а следовательно и в трех направлениях должна совершаться интонация почти каждого слова этой пьесы: реальная интонация героини, реальная же героя и формальная интонация автора-читателя... (Бахтин 1986, 8)

The 'intonation' in this context is the polarization of value of a person towards a thing. The example that Baxtin provides is a line from "Razluka:" "Для берегов отчизны дальной / Ты покидала край чужой" (Baxtin 1986, 8). Baxtin points out that it is from that heroine's point of view that the shores of her homeland are far. However, it is from the hero's point of view that she 'forsakes the foreign country' and the hero who observes her movement back to her homeland (Baxtin 1986, 8-9). The differences in delineation of value contexts is made through the choice of words and the imagery used (Baxtin 1986, 9).

In a non-lyric work there is a three-dimensional equation: the author, the heroes and the narrator. This situation involves more complex dynamics. Baxtin states:

> Реакцию героя, то есть выражение оценки предмета в ценностном контексте героя, мы будем называть реалистической реакцией — ей будет соответствовать реалистическая интонация и реалистический ритм, реакцию автора — оценку предмета в контексте автора — мы будем называть формальной реакцией, ей будет соответствовать формальная интонация и формальный ритм. (Бахтин 11)

In this context a distinction must be made between the 'realistic reaction' of the hero and the 'formal reaction' of the author towards a person or thing in the text. As cited previously, a field of valuation, which polarizes their

reactions and judgments towards people and things, surrounds all actors in the text. The narrator too displays to a varying extent opinions and judgments in his or her narration of the events contained in the text. The narrator's field of valuation does not necessarily coincide with the author's. In fact, they can potentially be radically different. The narrator's field of valuation affects the *sjužet*, the author's field of valuation — the absolute valuational standard of the novel — affects the *fabula*.

Through a study of the speech of the heroes it is possible to understand the position of the author as well, according to Baxtin, through the indirect reactions to the hero's speech:

> В эпосе прямая речь героев интонируется, как и в драме, реалистично, в косвенно приводимой автором речи героев возможно преобладание реакции реалистической, но возможно — и формальной, реакции автора; ведь слова героя, выражающие его ценностную позицию, автор может передавать, выражая в тоне передачи свое собственное отношение к ним, свою позицию по отношению к герою, например, иронически, удивленно, восторженно, в глубоко спокойном эпическом тоне и т. п. ...иногда же совершенно преобладает ценностный контекст автора, то есть слова описания мира героев выражают реакцию автора на героев и их мир. (Бахтин 1986, 12-3)

This method of determining the position of the person who describes the events of the heroes and their world is not limited to the view of the author. It is important to bear in mind that the position of the narrator can differ substantially from the position of the author. It is theoretically possible for the value context of the author to be closer to the value context of one of the heroes than to that of the narrator. In this case it would be more difficult to determine where the value context of the author is in relation to the heroes and the narrator, but it is entirely possible to make such a judgment. The way to make such a judgment is to compare the information presented by the narrator to information received from other sources. It is necessary to decode the information provided by the author in the text for such a judgment. It may be difficult to determine this circumstance because the narrator relates the text — both the descriptions of the circumstances and

the speech of the other characters. It is possible to determine that the narrator's position does not correspond with the author's by observing how the narrator interprets things and events. The author may lead the reader to interpret things and events differently from the narrator, thereby warning the reader that the narrator cannot be trusted. It is also theoretically possible that at times another narrator will relieve the usual one in sections of the novel. It may not be possible or feasible to prove such a change, but it can be theorized by the absence of formal attributes of the regular narrator's existence. A sudden change in style or values can be signs of the switch. These dynamics are why earlier Baxtin placed the reader's valuational context on a level with the authors: "первый круг объемлет второй, шире его, и оба они равно объемлются — как единое событие — формирующею активностью автора-читателя" (Baxtin 1986, 8).

In the interaction between valuational contexts, some contexts — corresponding to characters — may have privilege over others. A novel in which such is the case is called a monologic novel. A novel in which the valuational contexts surrounding each character is given relatively equal stature is the polyphonic novel. Baxtin identifies Dostoevskij as composing the first polyphonic novels. A feature of Dostoevskij's works is that the interior monologues of some characters is reproduced by other characters in dialogue. Baxtin's concept of the polyphonic novel is one where the narrator sufficiently recedes to make room for, as much as possible, a neutral, non-polarized in favor of one valuational field, relation of the action by the narrator.

In the context of such a description *Master i Margarita* cannot be said to be a polyphonic novel, because Woland and his values are clearly privileged, even above the narrator himself. However, Baxtin's methods are very useful in uncovering the dynamics of the other characters' interactions with Woland as well as the nature of Woland's privilege before the narrator.

2.2 Chapter 1: "Никогда не разговаривайте с неизвестными"

The first chapter of the novel begins with the story of the meeting of Woland with people active in Soviet culture: the editor Berlioz and the young poet Bezdomyj. The narrator describes the scene in which Woland questions Berlioz and Bezdomnyj concerning their belief, or lack of belief, in God. Woland expresses surprise upon learning that Berlioz and Bezdomnyj do not, in fact, believe in God. In reaction, "Он сделал испуганные глаза и прибавил: — Клянусь, я никому не скажу" (Bulgakov 1990, 12). The prefix and root /is-/ + /-pug-/ are repeated slightly later, "Да, мы не верим в Бога, — чуть улыбнувшись испугу интуриста, ответил Берлиоз, — но об этом можно говорить совсем свободно" (Bulgakov 1990, 12). The word *Испуг* is described as: "Сильное волнение от чего-н. страшного, пугающего (Vinokur 1935, 1:1246). The phrase "сделать испуганные глаза" has the implication of feigned fear, but Woland's interlocutors definitely perceive this fear as authentic. The opinion of the narrator, then, is that Woland was upset by something terrible, frightening. In the context of the novel it is highly unlikely that Woland, who is the devil and never looses control of the action throughout the course of the work, would, in fact, be frightened. It is plausible that the narrator echoes the observations of Berlioz or Bezdomnyj, by which Bulgakov emphasizes /ispugannyj — ispug/ through lexical repetition. Woland does give outward appearances of shock and awe.

Berlioz makes a statement concerning the official atheism of the Soviet Union, "...большинство нашего населения сознательно и давно перестало верить сказкам о Боге" (Bulgakov 1935, 12). Here, *сознательно* has special significance in the context of the atheism of Berlioz and Bezdomnyj and in the wider context of the moral structure of the novel.

The first meaning, for example, is found in Chapter Six the work of N. Berdjaev "Istoki i smysl russkogo kommunizma:" "Стихийности Ленин противополагал сознательность революционного меньшинства, которое призвано господствовать над общественным процессом" (Berdjaev 1955, 94).

A wider definition of *сознательный* is: "Намеренный, обдуманный, совершенный в состоянии сознания. <...> Состояние человека в здравом

уме и твердой памяти, способность воспринимать действительность и отдавать себе отчет в своих действиях, в своих переживаниях" (Vinokur 1935, 4:360). The emphasis of *сознательно* is something deliberately considered an intended. However, Berlioz uses this term in describing the active decision to stop believing in God.. Faith and belief are by nature an antithesis to that which can be considered "Намеренный, обдуманный." Whether or not the possibility of choosing to believe or disbelieve something can be argued, the term is still a discordant juxtaposition with the act of belief. Furthermore, later in the novel it is seen that Berlioz is, in fact, mistaken. This is proven by Bezdomnyj, his nominal supporter in the assertion of the triumph of atheism. Before being taken to the psychiatric clinic, Bezdomnyj becomes convinced that the powers of darkness are at work. He takes a candle and icon and symbolically baptizes himself in the Moscow River.

A further element is that of reality. One of the elements of the definition of *soznatel'nyj* is "способность воспринимать действительность." The understanding of 'reality' is one of the central themes of the novel, in which there are two competing understandings of reality. The first understanding is that expressed by Berlioz and, initially, Bezdomnyj, that maintains a rational, materialistic outlook on the world. The second understanding is that represented by Woland and his suite in the Moscow chapters and by Iešua in the Eršalaim chapters, which advocates a spiritual understanding of reality.

Woland, in pursing the question of reality, gives Berlioz and Bezdomnyj an ontological question: "Но вот какой вопрос меня беспокоит: ежели Бога нет, то, спрашивается, кто же управляет жизнью человеческой и всем вообще распорядком на земле?" (Bulgakov 1990, 14). It is significant that the question comes immediately after Berlioz's assertion of the triumph of atheism using the term *soznatel'no*. This question demonstrates the occasional powerlessness of human beings when they are faced with a fate they cannot alter, no matter how hard they might try. Berlioz and Bezdomnyj answer this ontological question with assertions

about how human beings control their own fate. Woland, however, counters with an example, the validity of which cannot be denied. Specifically, Berlioz, who thought he was the master of his fate, was beheaded that evening.

Further, Woland offers cigarettes to Berlioz and Bezdomnyj. The narrator states, "Поэт и владелец портсигара закурили, а некурящий Берлиоз отказался" (Bulgakov 1990, 15). This image of Woland as "владелец портсигара" provides an ironic contrast with Berlioz and Bezdomnyj's assertions that they control their own lives. Woland asserts that someone else, implicitly God, controls their fates, saying, "Не правильнее ли думать, что управился с ним кто-то совсем другой?" (Bulgakov 1990, 15). In some ways the author makes an implicit comparison between a human beings and a cigar case. The fact that Berlioz refuses but Bezdomnyj accepts a cigarette from the *vladelec* signals the fates of both Muscovites.

Woland has supernatural power over both. As the ontological conversation continues, Woland builds upon his argument that human beings are subject to sudden death. When Berlioz counters that he accepts the fact that a brick could fall upon him at any time, Woland replies that Berlioz will die a different death. The narrator relates Berlioz's response and offers commentary:

> — Может быть, вы знаете, какой именно? — с совершенно естественной иронией осведомился Берлиоз, вовлекаясь в какой-то действительно нелепый разговор. — И скажите мне? (Булгаков 1990, 16)

It is the narrator who makes the comment that it is natural that Berlioz answers with irony and that the conversation is absurd. From this description of Berlioz's reaction to Woland's words it becomes apparent to the reader that the narrator, at least in this chapter, has a different attitude towards Woland than does the author. The narrator sides with Berlioz and Berlioz's value-system in projecting the assessment *estestvennyj* onto Berlioz's employment of irony. Further, the narrator mocks Woland and his

assertions with the statement "нелепый разговор". The author sets up this mistaken conception of Woland.

Woland himself facilitates such a progression towards a fuller understanding of his character. When Woland appears for the very first time he purposefully takes the pose of a foreigner. His speech is disjointed and does not flow:

> — Извините меня, пожалуйста, — заговорил подошедший с иностранным акцентом, но не коверкая слов, — что я, не будучи знаком, позволяю себе... но предмет вашей ученой беседы настолько интересен, что... (Булгаков 1990, 11)

From the beginning all that is known to Berlioz, Bezdomnyj, the reader and, ostensibly, the narrator, is that Woland is a foreigner, based upon Woland's temporarily assumed foreign accent and his manner of dress. Further, Woland is often identified as *neizvestnyj*, which is how he is represented to Berlioz and Bezdomnyj. The narrator seems to share in this lack of any other way to identify Woland. When Woland identifies himself as a professor, the narrator also refers to him as *professor* and *učënyj*.

2.3 Chapter 2: "Понтий Пилат"

The second chapter of *Master i Margarita*, "Понтий Пилат", is narrated by Woland to Ivan Bezdomnyj and Mixail Berlioz. This section is particularly important because Woland's characteristics as a narrator become apparent. In this chapter there is no formal evidence of the existence of the regular narrator. Because Woland's narration completely fills the narrative space, taking up all of the room and performing all of the narrative functions, it can be said that, for all practical purposes, the regular narrator does not exist in Chapter Two. Rather, he disappears just before the end of Chapter One, when Woland asserts his own dominance:

> — И доказательств никаких не требуется, — ответил профессор и заговорил негромко, причем его акцент почему-то пропал: — Все просто: в белом плаще с кровавым подбоем, шаркающей кавалерийской походкой, ранним утром четырнадцатого месяца нисана... (Булгаков 1990, 19).

Those same lines that are at the end of the final paragraph of Chapter One are also the same as those in the first paragraph of Chapter Two. The final paragraph of Chapter One represents a transition point, in which the reader is invited to see Woland's assumption of narrative power. The second transition point is at the beginning of Chapter Three, when Woland again returns narrative power to the regular narrator, who once again becomes present after his long absence in Chapter Two:

> — Да, было около десяти часов утра, досточтимый Иван Николаевич, — сказал профессор. (Булгаков 1990, 43)

This statement is a repetition of the final line of the final paragraph of Chapter Two, "Было около десяти часов утра" (Bulgakov 1990, 42). The sentence itself is a separate paragraph in Chapter Two, marking it with special emphasis. These points represent the departure and return of the formal characteristics of the regular narrator.

Woland is very quick and efficient in establishing facts and descriptions. The most concrete example of this characteristic is evident in the first sentence:

> /В белом плаще с кровавым подбоем/ [как был одет?], /шаркающей кавалерийской походкой/ [как шел?], /ранним утром четырнадцатого числа весеннего месяца нисана/ [когда?] /в крытую колоннаду между двумя крыльями дворца Ирода Великого/ [где?] /вышел прокуратор Иудеи Понтий Пилат/ [кто что делал?].

I have isolated the individual clauses of this sentence and coupled them with questions to which each provides the answer. From this it becomes clear the first sentence, and paragraph, of Woland's narrator is a careful and concise establishment of the facts. The first paragraph of Chapter One has a similar form:

> В час жаркого весеннего заката на Патриарших прудах появилось двое граждан. Первый из них — приблизительно сорокалетний, одетый в серенькую летнюю пару, был маленького роста, темноволос, упитан, лыс, свою приличную шляпу пирожком нес в руке, а аккуратно выбритое лицо его

> украшали сверхъестественных размеров очки в черной роговой оправе. (Булгаков 1990, 7)

As Chapter One continues, the narrator begins asserting his own personality in the form of commentary, such as the statement "нелепый разговор" (Bulgakov 1990, 16).

The third paragraph begins with Pilate's interior monologue. The relation of the monologue by Woland indicates that Woland has clear access to Pilate's thoughts. The regular narrator usually conveys the interior impressions of characters but seldom relates interior monologues. The notable difference between the level of access between the regular narrator and Woland is very telling of the difference between the two in terms of their access to the authorial plane. The narrator, while accessing at rare times the information that belongs to the authorial sphere of knowledge, such as knowledge of the thoughts of other characters, only does so at rare times, and not in great detail. As becomes evident in Chapter Two, Woland has significantly more and clearer access to information on the authorial level. The fourth paragraph can also be shown to answer only clear hypothetical questions:

> На мозаичном полу у фонтана уже было приготовлено кресло, и прокуратор, не глядя ни на кого, сел в него и протянул руку в сторону. Секретарь почтительно вложил в эту руку кусок пергамента. Не удержавшись от болезненной гримасы, прокуратор искоса, бегло проглядел написанное, вернул пергамент секретарю и с трудом проговорил: (Булгаков 1990, 20)

In Chapter One, the second paragraph begins the pattern of subjective narrational intrusion, which is absent in Woland's narration of Chapter Two. In the first sentence of the second paragraph of Chapter 1, the narrator introduces Mixail Berlioz: "Перывй был не кто иной, как Михаил Александрович..." (Bulgakov 1990, 7). The /не кто иной/ is a telling example of this tendency. Phrases such as "Да, следует отметить..." (Bulgakov 1990) often lead in statements. Such statements are absent in Chapter 2. Dialogue is often conducted without any narrative intrusions whatsoever, but indicated only by punctuation. At the times when Woland

intrudes to signal a change of speaker in dialogue, the intrusion is both neutral and economical.

The first immediately obvious trait of Woland's 'uncertainty' within the narration is that it is much less pronounced than the uncertainty in the narration of the regular narrator.

The second noticeable trait is that whenever uncertainty appears in Woland's narration it is linked with other, less-informed characters, and is probably a reflection of their thoughts rather than any uncertainty on Woland's part. For example, in relating Pilate's interrogation of Iešua, Woland states,

> Никто не знает, что случилось с прокуратором Иудеи, но он позволил себе поднять руку, как бы заслоняясь от солнечного луча, и за этой рукой, как за щитом, послать арестанту какой-то немекающий взор. (Булгаков 1990, 31)

The statement that "Никто не знает..." ostensibly does not apply to Woland, because he has earlier related Pilate's unspoken plan for saving Iešua by sending the prisoner to Pilate's residence to work in the library. Woland earlier displayed a remarkably high degree of knowledge from the authorial level. The statement does, however, apply more to the scribe and surrounding company, who witness the interrogation and do not understand Pilate's unusual behavior.

The secretary's lack of understanding is repeatedly expressed by his surprise: "Удивление выразилось на лице секретаря, сгорбившегося над низенком столом и записывавшего показания" (Bulgakov 1990, 24). The "намекающий взор" is not understandable to the surrounding people, but it is understandable to Woland. Earlier I observed how the narrator would often reflect Berlioz's and sometimes Ivan's thoughts in Chapter 1 (Bulgakov 1990, 16). Woland is reflecting and narrating the thoughts of the people surrounding Pilate and Iešua in Chapter 2. The establishment of Woland as a 'knowing' narrator, contrasted to the regular narrator, who is significantly more 'unknowing', contributes to the reader's understanding of Woland as a character and his purpose.

The regular narrator can only occasionally access personal thoughts, but Woland is apparently able to do so at will. When Pilate speaks with the representatives of the High Priest, Woland is able to relate the Roman governor's personal thoughts. Furthermore, the way in which Woland relates his subject matter is also significant. In this section, Woland chooses to summarize the conversation rather than present it as dialogue. It is a summary of the situation and of Pilate's argument:

> В самом деле: преступления Вар-раввана и Га-Ноцри совершенно не сравнимы по тяжести. Если второй, явно сумасшедший человек, повинен в произнесении нелепых речей, смущавших народ в Ершалаиме и других некоторых местах, то первый отягощен гораздо значительнее. Мало того, что он позволил себе прямые призывы к мятежу, но он еще убил стража при попытках брать его. Вар-равван несравненно опаснее, нежели Га-Ноцри. (Булгаков 1990, 36)

Woland's relation of this dialogue is indicative of his omniscient position. Although the relation of the dialogue is based upon dialogue that anyone standing on the balcony could have overheard, Woland's presentation of the events as text within *Master i Margarita* and not in dialogue format give the statements an added authority. It is as if Pilate's arguments are given the stamp of objective fact, on a level with other observations in the narration. Thus, if the narrator is to be believed, this judgment of Pilate's is also to be taken as fact. Experience demonstrates that Woland is the most reliable and authoritative narrator in *Master i Margarita*. The reader, from observing facts that Woland, the Master and Berlioz independently confirm in their additions to the Eršalaim story, is in a position to confirm the veracity of the above paragraph. As Pilate ends his argument to Kaifa with a question:

> В силу всего изложенного прокуратор просит первосвященника пересмотреть решение и оставить на свободе того из двух осужденных, кто менее вреден, а таким, без сомнения, является Га-Ноцри. Итак?.. (Булгаков 1990, 36)

The final questioning word placed at the end of this paragraph is significant because of the way Woland presents it to the reader. The question echoes the audience's position of waiting to know what happened next, what the

result of Pilate's line of argumentation was. Woland uses the question as a narrative device for moving the story forward by building the reader's interest through creating suspense. There is another effect, too. Because the question is not included in direct representation of dialogue it is undifferentiated from a question that Woland might address to the reader or the listener of this story. Because of the lack of direction on the part of Woland towards his audience, it is a moot point as to who the question is directed to and what the nature of the question is. There are several possibilities: the question is addressed by Pilate to Kaifa, which is undoubtedly true on one level. Another possibility is that Woland addresses the question to Mixail Berlioz Ivan Bezdomnyj. A third possibility is that Woland addresses the question to the reader of *Master i Margarita*. Finally, it is possible that all statements are true. The fact that the text refers to Pilate in the third person may also be meaningful. While the significance may be that Pilate is referring to himself in the third person, it may also be that the speech in form is purely Woland's although the content would have been generated by the author for utterance by Pilate.

If Woland explicitly addresses the question to the reader, then the reader is called upon to anticipate Kaifa's response. This poses, again, that recurrent theme of the existential question. Woland makes reference to such a theme constantly through subtle use of his language.

2.4 Chapter 3: "Погоня"

After Berlioz's death, Bezdomnyj follows Woland and enters an apartment where he believes Woland is hiding. Inexplicably to himself and to the narrator, Ivan comes to the conclusion that he is dealing with infernal powers, takes an icon and candles with himself:

> Никому не известно, какая тут мысль овладела Иваном, но только, прежде чем выбежать на черный ход, он присвоил одну из этих свечей, а также и бумажную иконку. Вместе с этими предметами он покинул неизвестную квартиру...

> В пустынном безотрадном переулке поэт оглянулся, ища беглеца, но того нигде не было. Тогда Иван твердо сказал самому себе:
>
> — Ну конечно, он на Москве-реке! Вперед!
>
> Следовательно бы, пожалуй, спросить Ивана Николаевича, почему он так полагает, что профессор именно на Москве-реке, а не где-нибудь в другом месте. (Булгаков 1990, 53)

The narrator's ignorance of the reason for Ivan's actions is illustrated by the statement "Никому не известно, какая тут мысль овладела Иваном." The statement "мысль овладела Иваном" suggests that even Ivan himself did not understand why he took the icon and candles. Yet, Ivan is firm in his resolution to go to the Moscow River. Subconsciously, Ivan has knowledge that even the narrator does not have. At this point in the novel only the author, Woland and Ivan are aware to some extent of Woland's identity — the author and Woland are fully aware and Ivan is partially aware.

There are signs in Ivan's first encounter with Woland that Ivan comes to understand with whom he is really conversing. After telling the Eršalaim story, Woland specifically turns to Ivan and asks, "А дьявола тоже нет? — вдруг весело осведомился больной у Ивана Николаевича" (Bulgakov 1990, 45). The dialogue is continued with Ivan, although it has been broken off with Berlioz. A hint is given of this direction of Woland's focus onto Ivan at the beginning of Chapter 3 immediately after Woland narrators the first Eršalaim segment. Woland reiterates, "Да, было около десяти часов утра, досточтимый Иван Николаевич" (Bulgakov 1990, 43), completely ignoring Berlioz, who will die anyway. At least there is hope Ivan will reach understanding, so Woland cultivates him.

The narrator also has not fully grasped the significance of events. Although the narrator does not outwardly display the same mental struggle that Ivan does, he nevertheless fails to form and describe a coherent picture of events, and instead relies upon assumptions made falsely. In the moments immediately following Berlioz's death, Ivan tries to join the various things he has heard into a coherent understanding:

> К слову «Аннушка» привязались слова «подсолнечное масло», а затем почему-то «Понтий Пилат». Пилата поэт отринул и стал вязать цепочку, начиная со слова «Аннушка». И цепочка эта связалась очень быстро и тотчас привела к сумасшедшему профессору. (Булгаков 1990, 49)

The words that Woland has spoken and the significance of those words — namely the fact that Woland was present in Eršalaim and accurately predicted Berlioz's death — run counter to the ideology of the society in which Ivan lives and to which he has had to conform. The narrator, too, is unsure why Pontius Pilate is significant in this attempt at understanding, indicated when he himself says "...а затем почему-то «Понтий Пилат»." The narrator also continues to regard Woland as insane, "И цепочка эта связалась очень быстро и тотчас привела к сумасшедшему профессору." The judgment that Woland is insane is no longer valid, because that judgment was based partially on Woland's assertions that a Russian woman would behead Berlioz that evening, making his presence impossible at the MASSOLIT meeting. The assertion of Berlioz's impending death turn out to be true, and the other assertions are proven to be true later in the novel, yet the narrator himself has trouble reconciling himself to the truth of the Woland's statement about Berlioz's death and does not have the necessary future knowledge to understand the truthfulness of Woland's further statements. The author is aware that Woland is not insane, but the narrator is not yet aware, and the author must lead the narrator along with Ivan to the awareness that Woland is the devil and not insane.

As Chapter 4, "Pogonja," continues, Ivan chases after Woland, trying to grasp the meaning of what has happened before. Immediately after trying to synthesize events and recollections into a coherent explanation, the narrator directly states Ivan's thoughts:

> Виноват! Да ведь он же сказал, что заседание не состоится, потому что Аннушка разлила масло. И, будьте любезны, он не состоится! Этого мало: он прямо сказал, что Берлиозу отрежет голову женщина?! Да, да, да! Ведь вожатая-то была женщина! Что же это такое? А? (Булгаков 1990, 49)

The primary question here is: whose words are these and to whom are they addressed? The ostensible answer would be that they are Ivan's words addressed to himself. However, it is also possible that they reflect the thoughts and concerns of both Ivan and the narrator. There is no clear marker of ownership attached to them. However, there are implications that they are more the narrator's words addressed to the reader than Ivan's thoughts addressed to himself. The phrase "будьте любезны" may be said ironically by Ivan to himself, or it may be a direct address of the narrator to his audience. It is the narrator, after all, who must convey Ivan's thoughts to the audience. The final sentences, "Да, да, да! Ведь вожатая-то была женщина! Что же это такое? А?" reflect the process of questioning and striving to understand. They also reflect the narrator's uncertainty. In the following paragraph Ivan forms a theory as to how events could have unfolded they way they did:

> Не оставалось зерна сомнения в том, что таинственный консультант точно знал заранее всю картину ужасной смерти Берлиоза. Тут две мысли пронизали мозг поэта. Первая: «Он отнюдь не сумасшедший! Все это глупости!», и вторая: «Уж не подстроил ли он все это сам?!»
>
> Но, позвольте спросить, каким образом?!
>
> — Э, нет! Это мы узнаем! (Булгаков 1990, 49)

Both Ivan and the narrator have understood that Woland did know about Berlioz's death in advance. However, they both come to the conclusion that Woland himself planned Berlioz's death. The first sentence of the first quoted paragraph does not have specific markers identifying the originator of the thoughts, and it is again quite likely that the thoughts are expressed both by Ivan and the narrator and conveyed by the narrator. Throughout the chapter it becomes obvious that the narrator shares Ivan's perspective on the situation, as demonstrated when Ivan tries to locate the professor after Berlioz's death:

> Сделав над собой великое усилие, Иван Николаевич поднялся со скамьи и бросился назад, туда, где разговаривал с профессором. И оказалось, что тот, к счастью, еще не ушел. (49)

The narrator's assertion of "к счастью" is a reflection of Ivan's own desire to catch the professor. The narrator displays his or her own lack of understanding by sharing in Ivan's desire to catch Woland. Even more than that, by sharing in Ivan's desire to apprehend Woland, the narrator inevitably shares in Ivan's moral valuation. The narrator echoes Ivan's implicit belief that it is morally necessary to catch Woland and turn in over to the militia. This moral valuation, reflected by the seemingly impartial language of the narrator, is reflected throughout the entire novel. The narrator and Ivan are connected by their mutually supportive reception of events. When Ivan makes a mistaken judgment, the narrator repeats it. Immediately upon catching sight of Woland, Ivan thinks he sees a rapier instead of a cane: "...в лунном, всегда обманчивом, свете Ивану Николаевич показалось, что тот стоит, держа под мышкою не трость, а шпагу" (49). In Chapter 18, "Неудачливые визитеры," several rapiers are shown to be sitting in the umbrella stand by the door. Therefore it is quite likely that Woland was, at the time the narrator saw him, holding a rapier. This suggests that the narrator is just as ignorant of the nature of this meeting as Ivan is.

When Ivan attempts to apprehend Woland, Korov'ev intercepts Ivan and prevents him from moving closer to Woland. The narrator refers to Korov'ev as "мерзкий регент,": 'the vile choirmaster,' which is a reflection of Ivan's view of Korov'ev. The following dialogue presents a phenomenon that is present throughout the entire novel, though especially present in the chapters before "Великий бал у Сатаны", that is the blending of lexical fields within the same context, sometimes within the same sentence. When describing how Ivan pursues Woland, the narrator uses the term "преследуемый" in referring to Woland, Korov'ev and Begemot. This official-sounding term is oddly placed in the description of Ivan's pursuit of Woland, which employs primarily conversational lexicon. The author may have placed these lexical markers in the text to provide information about the narrator and his view of Woland and Woland's company. However, the focus of this is not on the narrator but on Woland. When Korov'ev continues blocking Ivan's path, the narrator describes Ivan's internal state as "впадая в гнев."

Although a standard expression, it is not as common as other possible lexical choices, such as the verb *рассердиться*. The employment of /впадая в гнев/ could be seen as marked if considered in the context of Chapter 18: "Неудачливые визитеры." During the banquet worker's visit, Woland says: "Я люблю сидеть низко...с низкого не так опасно падать" (201). This is an oblique allusion to the Lucifer of the New Testament. Although Woland more resembles the Satan of the Old Testament, testing Job for the sake of God, the author still plays on various innuendos of the devil throughout history and artistic tradition. This is one of several hints scattered throughout the text as to Woland's true identity. However, it is ironically applied to Ivan rather than to Woland, which is also significant. The application of /впадая в гнев/ to Ivan rather than to the devil, for whom /падать/ would be traditionally more applicable, serves to emphasize Woland's unique position. Woland is not fallen — he is, like the Satan of the Old Testament, a servant of God. The author, not the narrator is active in identifying Ivan as, ironically, the one who falls. This ironic contrast draws attention to and underlines the author's ordering of the novel, that Woland is not fallen but is instead a force of good. The author increases this ironic contrast by his continuation description of Ivan's progression into anger: "Ты нарочно под ногами путаешься? — зверея, закричал Иван" (Bulgakov 1990, 50). The employment of /зверея/: 'falling into beastial fury,' is significant because it illustrates a dehumanization of Ivan, who allows his lack of understanding and his anger to supercede reason and balance. Normally it is the devil who is associated with animals to accentuate a lack of humanism and divinity. Woland, however, does posses these characteristics, whereas many humans in the novel do not. The ironic shift by the author draws the reader's attention to Woland, giving subtle hints as to his identity, and at the same time providing the readers with keys to the interpretation of Woland's nature.

2.5 The Epilogue of *Master i Margarita*

As stated above, the narrator must come to understanding of the situation gradually, along with the reader. This becomes especially evident

at the Epilogue, when the narrator still tries to piece everything together, but is unable to do so. It is as if the narrator were one of the investigators, still trying to piece together what happened even after the departure of Woland, his suite, the Master and Margarita. It is significant that the Epilogue begins with a question:

> Но все-таки, что же было дальше-то в Москве после того, как в субботний вечер на закате Воланд покинул столицу, исчезнув вместе со своей свитой с Воробьевых гор? (372)

The language of this paragraph is colloquial, indicated by /все-таки/ and /дальше-то/. It can be inferred that the question is not entirely rhetorical, as the entire Epilog may be an attempt to piece events together into a coherent understanding. In the following paragraph, the narrator makes a rare self-reference: "Пишущий эти правдивые строки сам лично, направляясь в Феодосию, слышал в поезде рассказ..." (373). This marker of subjectivity may be significant in the realm of identifying Woland's position within the novel. In this way a study of narrative techniques is actually a study of Woland, because of their necessary reactions to Woland. The narrator's language in the opening sections of the novel is consistent with his language in the Epilog. In both areas the narrator's language is colloquial, yet 'official' lexical units are mixed into the overtly colloquial context. Both zones of the novel display narrative uncertainty in relation to Woland and his suite. Both zones represent an attempt by the narrator to come to terms with events he does not understand.

2.6 Conclusions to the Chapter

In *Master i Margarita* there are two narrators: the regular narrator, who has the level of understanding of one of the Moscow characters, and Woland, who is a supplemental narrator in Chapter Two.

The regular narrator, who describes the action in the Moscow sections, is not reliable or omniscient. The author even treats the narrator with irony because of the narrator's naïveté concerning the events of the novel and their meaning. The narrator simply cannot understand things that the author

makes apparent to the reader. Woland, however, is omniscient and reliable, and Bulgakov uses him to guide the readers as well as certain other characters through the complex meanings of his work.

I have established that the narrator in Chapters One and Three is highly subjective and not endowed with authorial knowledge. Because he often takes the position of the characters who come in contact with Woland the regular narrator can be regarded as one of them. The narrator remains as such throughout the entire novel, which is especially visible in the Epilogue.

In Chapter One it becomes clear as the novel progresses that the author has a much more serious relation as regards to Woland, even though he may sometimes treat Woland with irony. Just as at the end of the novel Woland assumes his true form, even though the reader is never allowed to see it, so the novel contains a progression of the narrator's understanding. The reader is gradually led to an understanding that Woland is the devil, but the narrator is never fully enlightened, he never comes to this conclusion, but instead remains completely oblivious throughout the entire novel. However, the narrator does progress in his understanding of Woland's importance and position. The narrator's treatment of Woland reflects this gradual change in position towards Woland, although the author makes subtle hints. From the authorial point of view such a conversation is not absurd. It strikes at one of the central themes of the book, which is the ontological question of the human being's place in the universe and what values are congruent with reality. The gradual enlightenment and understanding of the narrator pulls the reader along, too, showing him or her the way to approach the difficult themes contained within the novel. It is significant that no one, including the narrator, can recognize Woland for who he is except for Bezdomnyj. Later the Master and Margarita are intuitively able to recognize him, something that even the narrator fails to do.

The narrator is unreliable, while Woland is reliable. The narrator often makes mistakes concerning the *fabula* of the novel, while Woland's statements are never incongruous with what the reader can observe to be

the truth in the context of the novel. In *Master i Margarita,* Woland's valuational context is a very close match to the formal position, not the realistic valuational context of the narrator and the other characters, excluding the members of Woland's suite, who are contingent upon Woland.

Comparing these two narrators, their positions, attitudes and the levels of information to which they have access will revealed what place they occupy in the novel. Woland represents the author because of his access to information on the authorial level and his understanding of other characters, which the regular narrator is denied. Woland has such privilege because, at some moments, Bulgakov himself uses Woland to express his own thoughts and desires

Master i Margarita cannot be classified as a polyphonic novel as such. The hallmark of a polyphonic novel is that one character reproduces the internal monologue of another character in dialogue with that character. In such an instance the character who reproduces the interior monologue is classified as "the Other" in relation to his or her interlocutor. Woland functions as the other and he has knowledge of the interior monologues of his interlocutors, but he does not reproduce them.

In Chapter Two of the novel Woland significantly differentiates himself from the narrator in many ways, including less intrusion into the narrative, there are similarities as well. For example, both Woland and the regular narrator are ostensibly present at the events they describe. However, neither takes an active role or seems to be seen by the characters in the events described.

While certain things are explicitly beyond the knowledge of the regular narrator, it can be argued that when Woland states something is beyond knowledge, he implies that it is beyond the knowledge of others, but not of himself.

The paradox that a character in the novel is more 'knowing' than the narrator contributes to the special nature of Woland's position as a source of enlightenment and a higher, otherworldly consciousness, which the regular narrator does not possess. This element of *Master i Margarita* is one of many

reinforcing factors that underline Woland's position in relation to the author, the narrator and the other characters.

The visible absence of Woland in the Eršalaim chapters is similar to Satan's absence in the story of Job. Except for Satan's discussion with God, Satan is never seen. Although Satan is responsible for Job's misfortunes, the reader never sees Satan take an active role in them. It is the same in the Eršalaim chapters — although Woland is present, he is never visible. Instead he is in the background, completely unseen by the reader. Although Woland himself is never visible to the reader, his narration reflects three types of access: description of the surroundings, dialogue, and personal thoughts. The three types of access represent different levels, from easiest to most difficult to access for the ordinary person as well as the regular narrator of *Master i Margarita*.

The style at the beginning of both chapters is similar in that initially both chapters display great economy of expression. As Chapter One progresses the narrator begins to make personal interjections of judgment that coincides with the viewpoints of Berlioz and Bezdomnyj. As Chapter One progresses, while the trend of sentence length remains consistent overall, the content itself is changed. The narrator uses colloquialisms and personal interjections, denoting *skaz* style. Woland's narration, while definitely a verbal narration, is marked by an absence of personal interjections and colloquialisms, indicating the absence of *skaz* style.

The narrator's moral stance at the beginning of *Master i Margarita* is one of very slight opposition to Woland, which reflects the suspicion of the characters who first meet him. Such a desire suggests belief that it would be possible to catch and hold Woland. Such a thing is impossible, though, because Woland is extremely powerful and cannot be held by human forces. This becomes evident at the end of the novel in the chapter "Конец квартиры № 50," suggesting that the narrator doesn't even have prior knowledge of the end of the story he is narrating.

It should be remembered that Woland and the author both use irony of which the narrator is not aware. In this way Woland, with the collusion of

the author, satirizes the surrounding world. Because of their surrounding, but not all-embracing positions, the narrator can be seen as connected with Moscow society. But Woland represents something authorial. Woland's knowledge and authority supercede that of the narrator.

The result of Woland's superceding the narrator is that Woland can be identified with the authorial position, even though his position is only slightly below that of the author, while the narrator occupies the position of just another character. The author's identification with Woland has great significance for an understanding of Woland's character. The fact that Woland has access to the authorial sphere demonstrates that Woland serves as the moral compass for the novel. Bulgakov expresses himself through Woland, who consequently is the most authorial and reliable character of the novel.

3. Strategies of Dialogue According to M. M. Baxtin

3.1 Introduction

Dialogue is always an important part of any novel. It contains overt and covert information on the speakers and the subject matter. M. Baxtin researches the significance of dialogue for Dostoevskij and the strategies and functions of the interlocutors of the dialogue. The strategies and functions differ for different interlocutors.

According to one definition, dialogue is as follows:

> 1. Разговор между двумя или несколькими лицами. || Часть литературного произведения, состоящая из разговоров. 2. Литературное произведение, написанное в форме разговора (лат.). *Диалоги Платона*. (Винокур 1935, 1:705-6)

All of the definitions provided by this dictionary are useful: conversation between two or more people; a part of a literary work consisting of conversations; a literary work, written in the form of a conversation. In Baxtin's usage, the first two definitions: conversation between two or more people; a part of a literary work consisting of conversations are certainly applicable. The third definition provided, number two after the parallel horizontal lines, stating that dialogue alone can be a literary work, serves at least to remind the investigator of dialogue's potential to bear the full burden of meeting the definition as a fully-fledged work. This means it must tell a story or portray a thing, scene, person or event. The example provided by Vinokur, the dialogues of Plato, also illustrate the didactic role that dialogue can play, both for those who take part and for those who listen.

3.2 "При свечах"

Margarita becomes acquainted with Woland after her meeting with Azazello, who uses Margarita's internal dialogue to get her attention, and promises her the return of the Master. In Chapter 22, "При свечах," Margarita meets Woland for the first time. She enters Apartment 50 and is let to Woland's bedroom, where they begin a dialogue about life in general and what Woland wants from her in particular. Woland first addresses Margarita with slight irony: "Приветствую вас, королева, и прошу меня

извинить за мой домашний наряд" (Bulgakov 1990, 246). Woland's smile before this statement is suggestive of the light humor of the statement: "Наконец Воланд заговорил, улыбнувшись, отчего его искристый глаз как бы вспыхнул..." (Bulgakov 1990, 246). There is no sign, however, that the irony is directed at Margarita, or any indication of direction at all. The irony might instead be directed at the reader as a commentary upon Woland's position in the text. The author directs this irony at the reader on a higher level of knowledge and understanding. The author is still hinting at and playing with Woland's identity, and the author plays upon the irony that the devil is not subject to the judgments of human beings and does not have to dress up for them. In this instance the author focuses his irony through Woland towards the reader. This action represents a greater trend in the novel, in which the author directs his own thoughts and feelings to the reader through the figure of Woland.

Woland's manner of dress is conveyed by the narrator: "Воланд широко раскинулся на постели, был одет в одну ночную длинную рубашку, грязную и заплатанную на левом плече" (Bulgakov 1990, 246). This description is a marked contrast to Woland's greeting of Margarita, in which he calls her "королева." The narrator subtly underscores Woland's position in the context of the novel — as the devil he is not subordinate to any human being.

There are only very slight formal indicators of the narrator's presence. The narrator does offer some subjective commentary, but refrains from any extensive asides or interjections. Furthermore, the narrator does not treat any of the interlocutors of this dialogue with irony. The personal observations of the narrator are minimal, as demonstrated by the narrator's descriptions of the interlocutors. Whereas in Chapter One, the narrator's commentary upon the interlocutors was heavy, here it is light: "Ни в коем случае, мессир, — справившись с собой, тихо, но ясно ответила Маргарита..." (Bulgakov 1990, 247). The narrator makes no ironic observations about Margarita herself, and only uses the neutral terms "тихо" and "ясно" to describe Margarita's speech. Earlier, when describing how

Korov'ev whispers into Margarita's ear, the narrator uses only one neutral adverb:

> Воланд взял с постели длинную шпагу, наклонившись, пошевелил ею под кроватью и сказал:
> — Вылезай! Партия отменяется. Прибыла гостья.
> — Ни в каком случае, — тревожно свистнул по-суфлерски над ухом Маргариты Коровьев. (Булгаков 1990, 246)

The narrator in this chapter is not able to read Margarita's thoughts, unlike in Chapter 22, where he is able to reproduce her internal monologue. He is, however, able to understand her physical sensations:

> Он протянул руку и поманил к себе Маргариту. Та подошла, не чувствуя пола под босыми ногами. Воланд положил свою тяжелую, как будто каменную, и в то же время горячую, как огонь, руку на плечо Маргариты, дернул ее к себе и посадил на кровать рядом с собою. (Булгаков 1990, 247)

Not only is the narrator able to sense that Margarita could not feel the floor through her bare feet, but he is also able to describe Margarita's sensations when Woland touches her shoulder.

The narrator does not have knowledge of what Woland is thinking, even though he tries to make guesses based on his external observations:

> — Коня не могу найти, — задушенным и фальшивым голосом отозвался из-под кровати кот, — ускакал куда-то, а вместо него какая-то лягушка попадается.
> — Не воображаешь ли ты, что находишься на ярмарочной площади? — притворяясь рассерженным, спрашивал Воланд. — Никакой лягушки не было под кроватью! Оставь эти дешевые фокусы для Варьете. Если ты сейчас же не появишься, мы будем считать, что ты сдался, проклятый дезертир. (Булгаков 1990, 247).

In this section of dialogue the narrator leads the reader to an understanding of what both Margarita and Woland are physically sensing.. However, this understanding is very limited and superficial. For Margarita it encompasses physical sensations and for Woland it encompasses the knowledge that Woland was only pretending at being angry.

The dialogue between Woland and Margarita occurs in the same timeframe that the dialogue between Woland and Begemot occurs. The two

dialogues are closely intermingled. While Woland and Margarita are discussing their situation, Woland and Begemot are discussing their game of chess in great detail. Begemot tries to cheat while Woland is able to successfully conduct the game without looking at the board but remembering the position of the pieces instead.

One possibility for the significance of the intermingling of the dialogues is the significance of chess in Christian and other cultures. Chess is often used as a metaphor for fate and death. The American folklorist Stith Thompson identifies chess as a test in Irish mythology, (1955, 1:421), a game of the gods in Chinese tradition (1955, 1:92) and lists an incident in Icelandic mythology when a king is playing chess when important news arrives (1955, 5:143). Ingar Bergman's film *The Seventh Seal* (1956), one of the central symbols of which is a knight playing chess against death. The film did not manufacture this metaphor. Instead it drew on a long tradition in European culture equating chess with fate, inevitably ending in death. Indeed, the Russian term /šaxmaty/ is derived from the Persian phrase 'The king is dead' (Fasmer 1973, 415). Both *Master i Margarita* and *The Seventh Seal* were created in the context of a common tradition. Because they both drew upon the same raw cultural material they incorporate some of the same underlying metaphors and images.

Woland and his suite, because of his omnipotence, or at the very least near-omnipotence, could be analogous to gods. The tradition of chess as a game of the gods may be representational of its further significance in representing fate, which gods had the power to affect. Chess as a game of the gods resonates with the Icelandic story of a king, another symbol of ultimate power, playing chess when important news arrives. Woland and Begemot are playing chess when Margarita arrives. Chess is a natural representation for a test — it is literally a test of strategic thinking, an image that can easily be carried over into the sphere of the metaphoric.

The two most significant connotations of chess that operate in *Master i Margarita* are the equation of chess with fate and death and the connotation of chess as a test. In the subtext of *Master i Margarita* Woland is deciding

their fate. At the same time, in order to clearly decide their fate, Woland is testing Margarita. This test, the result of which will determine the fate of Margarita and the Master, continues during the chess dialogue, until its final resolution.

In connection with the chess motif in the dialogue there is also the theme of cards. This motif makes its appearance twice: the first time is when Korov'ev leads Margarita to meet Woland in Chapter 22. Korov'ev says:

> И если бы расспросить некоторых прабабушек и в особенности тех из них, что пользовались репутацией смиренниц, удивительнейшие тайны открылись бы, уважаемая Маргарита Николаевна. Я ничуть не погрешу, если, говоря об этом, упомяну о причудливо тасуемой колоде карт. Есть вещи, в которых совершенно недействительны ни сословные перегородки, ни даже границы между государствами. (Булгаков 1990, 245)

Korov'ev's statement constructs a direct correlation between a deck of cards and fate. Woland repeats Korov'ev's formulation later in the chapter: "Да, прав Коровьев. Как причудлива тасуется колода! Кровь!" (Bulgakov 1990, 247). Thompson lists the following connotations of cards in folklore: "Dead persons play cards...devil appears when cards are played...devil plays cards...playing cards with devil in church (fear test)..." (Thompson 1955, 6:117). Cards are connected with fate, death, testing and the devil, in the same way that chess is.

In another episode, Maksimilian Andreevič, the headwaiter of the Griboedov restaurant, visits Woland to settle an account. When he visits Apartment No. 50, Woland offers him wine and games:

> Так не прикажете ли партию в кости? Или вы любите другие какие-нибудь игры? Домино, карты?
>
> — Не играю, — уже утомленный, отозвался буфетчик.
>
> — Совсем худо, заключил хозяин... (Булгаков 1990, 202)

Maksimilian Andreevič refuses to engage in a game with Woland. His refusal is representative of a failure to acknowledge that his fate does not belong to him to decide, similar to Berlioz's viewpoint. Like Berlioz, Maksimilian

Andreevič suffers death, this time due to illness. The game represents a test that Maksimilian Andreevič refuses even to take.

Margarita, however, begins to understand the subtext that Berlioz and Maksimilian Andreevič failed to understand. Margarita recognizes that her fate does not rest entirely in her hands and that she is being tested on her willingness to accept a higher power. When Margarita first meets Woland, she works to learn the rules of the subtext. In the subtext, the game of chess that Woland and Begemot is playing represents Woland's deliberation of the fate of Margarita and the Master. When Margarita first enters the room, Woland takes a rapier, a symbol of death, and makes a pretence of ending the game, which by extension would negate Margarita's chance for her fate to be altered happily:

> — Вылезай! Партия отменяется. Прибыла гостья.
> — Ни в каком случае, — тревожно свистнул по-суфлерски над ухом Маргариты Коровьев.
> — Мессир... — дохнул Коровьев в ухо.
> — Ни в каком случае, мессир, справившись с собой, тихо, но ясно ответила Маргарита и, улыбнувшись, добавила: — я умоляю вас не прерывать партии. Я полагаю, что шахматные журналы заплатили бы недурные деньги, если б имели возможность ее напечатать. (Булгаков 1990, 246-7)

Korov'ev helps Margarita in adapting to the rules of the running subtext by prompting her in her initial responses. The word "тревожно" is an indicator of the seriousness of the situation, suggesting the solemnity of what appears to be a game on the surface, but in reality is the deliberation of Margarita's and the Master's fates.

When explaining the subtext to her in such a way, Korov'ev also instructs Margarita how to address Woland, indicating his importance. Because his title is a foreign borrowing, it also emphasizes Woland's otherness, foreignness from the normal life Margarita is used to. When Margarita smiles and begins to speak without Korov'ev's prompting, she has assimilated the conventions of the subtext and begins to maneuver in it on her own. She offers a superficial reason for Woland not to cancel the game. The explanation is obviously superficial because money is of no concern for

the devil, and Margarita, in renouncing her past comfortable life, has demonstrated that money is also of no concern for her. The reason she does not want the game cancelled is that she recognizes her own fate is being decided on a deeper level using the metaphor of the game. Ostensibly the chess journals would have paid a great deal of money to print the game because of the devil's reputation for being an exceptional chess-player, an allusion to the place that chess and cards hold in folk culture as pointed out by Thompson. Begemot's attempt to cheat is a demonstration that a person cannot cheat fate, the representative of which is Woland.

In this chapter Margarita offers her services as the hostess of the ball to Woland but does not demand anything in return. When Azazello and Margarita first meet, Woland's minion tempts her to demand what she wants from Woland. Azazello's temptation becomes apparent in Chapter 24, when Margarita thinks to herself: "Попросить, что ли, самой, как искушающе советовал Азазелло в Александровском саду?" (Bulgakov 1990, 273). Margarita also begs Woland not end his deliberation of her fate and, as Margarita plays by the rules of her examination, Woland becomes convinced that she is capable to conduct the ball. When Margarita says to herself upon first seeing Woland, "Он изучает меня" Bulgakov 1990, 246), she also apparently realizes that the examination continues throughout her dialogue with him. The examination is satisfactorily concluded when Woland finally demands that Begemot give up: "Ты сдаешься или нет? — прокричал страшным голосом Воланд" (Bulgakov 1990, 250). Woland has decided Margarita's fate, and continuation of the game is unnecessary.

In addition to the intertwining of Margarita's dialogue with Woland about the ball and the chess dialogue between Woland and Begemot, there is a third dialogue: that between Margarita and Woland concerning Abadonna. In this context, the dialogue about Abadonna can be seen as a continuation of the previous two. The progression of dialogue is: Satan's ball — chess — Abadonna. All three themes, if the chess theme is accepted as a metaphor for time and death, are intimately connected with death, fate on earth and the next world. This progression could also be interpreted as: human

actions, the results of which are visible at the ball as becomes apparent in the next chapter — the deliberation of fate conducted by Woland, the judge — a human beings final fate, represented by Abadonna, who is like the angel of death.

Abadonna represents another factor in the world of *Master i Margarita*. Abadonna is a destroyer, but unlike Woland, he does not have purpose for his destruction. It is not to punish the wicked; it is violence for its own sake. Dark glasses cover Abadonna's eyes, depriving him of any power of perception. Abadonna also functions as the angel of death. When Margarita becomes frightened of Abadonna, Woland says:

> Ведь видите же, что он в очках. Кроме того, никогда не было случая, да и не будет, чтобы Абадонна появился перед кем-нибудь преждевременно. Да и, наконец, я здесь. Вы у меня в гостях! Я просто хотел вам его показать. (Булгаков 1990, 252)

Abadonna does not display preferences, but appears to each person only at the proper time. After deliberating during the chess game, Woland has decided to allow Margarita to request the return of the Master. Margarita's fate is under Woland's protection, and so Abadonna is harmless to her.

Abadonna's representation of blind violence and death ties into another literary tradition. Abadonna is represented as being present in a war, probably the Spanish Civil War. The correlation of fate and death, especially by a higher power, with chess is reminiscent of Puškin's "Car' uvidel pred soboju:"

> Царь увидел пред собою
> Столик с шахматной доскою.
>
> Вот на шахматную доску
> Рать солдатиков из воску
> Он расставил в стройный ряд.
> Грозно куколки сидят,
> Подбоченясь на лошадках
> В коленкоровых перчатках,
> В оперенных шишачках,
> С палашами на плечах.
>
> Тут лохань перед собою

Приказал налить водою;
Плавать он пустил по ней
Тьму прекрасных кораблей,
Барок, каторог и шлюпок
Из ореховых скорлупок —
А прозрачные ветрильцы
Будто бабочкины крильцы,
А веревки (Пушкин 1959, 420)

Like *Master i Margarita*, this poem also contains a subtext. The obvious, overt text is that the tsar is playing chess. In the subtext the tsar is conducting an actual war, and that the waxen chess pieces are real people and real ships. Another implication is that the tsar is actually God or fate directing war. Woland is analogous to the tsar of this poem because Woland decides fate and passes judgment. Abadonna is only a manifestation of the violence that people decide to unleash upon each other and its consequences.

The poem is a well-known example of chess used to represent fate and death in Russian culture. Bulgakov was intimately familiar with the works of Puškin. It is most likely that Puškin's system of metaphor influenced Bulgakov's understanding of the themes of fate and death. In all of these cases, the subtext is necessary to correctly interpret the events. Bulgakov's connection of this poem with his text reinforces the position that Woland holds as a judge and the relative powerlessness of human beings over their own fates.

In Chapter 22 the narrator recedes into the background and leaves Woland, his suite and Margarita to conduct their dialogue in peace. The dialogue in Chapter One is unified. It is exclusively about humanity's mortality, the uncertainty of life on earth, and a human being's responsibility. Chapter 22 contains three elements: introduction to Satan's ball, chess, and Abadonna. With an examination of the subtext these themes form a unified whole, like Chapter One. The narrator becomes silent because Woland conducts his subtext, where any intrusion from the narrator would be distracting. This fact suggests that Woland himself has power over the

narrator, and that the narrator cannot interfere where it is not convenient for Woland.

3.3 "Извлечение мастера"

Another dialogue of significance in after Satan's ball, in Chapter 24, "Извлечение мастера." It is very similar to the dialogue of Chapter 22. One subtle but potentially important difference is the inclusion of a value judgment by the narrator, which is absent in the description of the dialogue between Woland and Margarita in Chapter 22. The narrator states:

> В спальне Воланда все оказалось, как было до бала. Воланд в сорочке сидел на постели, и только Гелла не растирала ему ногу, а на столе, там, где раньше играли в шахматы, накрывала ужин. Коровьев и Азазелло, сняв фраки, сидели у стола, и рядом с ними, конечно, помещался кот, не пожелавший расстаться с своим галстухом, хоть он и превратился в совершеннейшую грязную тряпку. (Булгаков 1990, 267)

The scene is the same as it was before the ball, but the circumstances are different. After the ball Margarita has developed as a person. Her proximity to Woland has increased her understanding of the nature of the world. However, she still does not manage the subtext perfectly.

Woland's refusal to be interrupted by Begemot is a signal that the dialogue in Chapter 22 was important in the subtext. The irony here is that the devil uses the expression "черт тебя возьми!" — a common expression, but one loaded with irony when uttered by the devil himself. Whether this irony is intentional or unintentional on Woland's part, it is certainly intentional on the author's part. One function of the use of irony in this section is that it draws attention to itself and to Woland's position. As the ironist, Woland himself is not a subject. This delineation is a contrast to Berlioz and Bezdomnyj in Chapter One, who themselves are the subject of irony. The fact that Woland uses irony but is not subject to its application calls attention to his unique and privileged position in the novel.

In the place where fate was decided in Chapter 22, the suite is now eating in Chapter 24. The narrator's statement "где раньше играли в

шахматы" is significant because there must be a specific reason for reminding the reader that Woland and Begemot were playing chess there. Already the narrator does not comment on Woland's dress in such detail, saying only that he was wearing a shirt. The adjective *грязный* has been transferred from Woland to Begemot. Like Margarita, the narrator may have become more knowledgeable, as represented by the shift in focus of the narration. The inclusion of "конечно" represents an expectation that Begemot is supposed to be with Korov'ev and Azazello. As such it is a statement of valuation. The statement reflects the value that a natural order within Woland's suite exists. The narrator contrasts the understanding of this order with Korov'ev's reactions when Margarita describes the security agents monitoring the apartment:

> — Ну да, ну да... А то ведь дело в том, что этот человек на лестнице... Вот когда мы проходили с Азазелло... И другой у подъезда... Я думаю, что он наблюдал за вашей квартирой...
>
> — Верно, верно! — кричал Коровьев. — Верно, дорогая Маргарита Николаевна! Вы подтверждаете мои подозрения! Да, он наблюдал за квартирой! Я сам было принял его за рассеянного приват-доцента или влюбленного, томящегося на лестнице. Но нет, нет! Что-то сосало мое сердце! Ах, он наблюдал за квартирой! И другой у подъезда тоже! И тот, что был в подворотне, то же самое! (Булгаков 1990, 270)

Baron Majgel''s execution demonstrates that Woland and the members of his suite are aware that Baron Majgel' was an informer and that they knew well the apartment was under surveillance. Korov'ev's reaction, then, must be ironic. The language of the dialogue suggests that the information surprises him. His repetition of "верно" and the use of the verb "кричать" are used to describe his reaction. The use of the construction "было принял" further accentuates the irony in Korov'ev's speech. Korov'ev's repetition of the phrase "Да, он наблюдал за квартирой!" twice further enhances the irony of the situation, as well as the triple enumeration of the agents observing the apartment. The author accentuates the ironic impact of Korov'ev's speech by the frequent use of exclamation points. This represents a test for Margarita.

Unlike the test with the subtext in Chapter 22, Margarita does not pass this test. In Chapter 22 Margarita was able to understand, adapt to and use the subtext. However, Margarita here fails to understand the irony in Korov'ev's speech. Margarita also fails to understand that Woland and his suite are not in the department of mercy but rather of justice when she asks Woland to release Frida.

Woland tests Margarita's knowledge of the proper way to conduct oneself with the devil. It is important not to ask for anything but rather wait until it is offered. Margarita understands this, and the narrator also understands it, using the word "вопросительно", 'imploringly,' when describing how Margarita looks at Woland. The narrator is able to observe and understand Margarita's reaction to this situation. Further, the narrator is able to summarize Margarita's interior monologue, even though he does not reproduce it directly until Margarita says to herself "Нет, ни за что!" The narrator understand's Azazello's purpose when the narrator says "...как искушающе советовал Азазелло..." Azazello tempts Margarita to ask, knowing that according to the rules of dealing with the devil established in the novel it is wrong to ask, but instead a person must wait until something is offered. Both Margarita and the narrator have acquired enough insight to understand that it is a test. This insight comes after Woland's ball. The ball provided Margarita with the experience of the moral system necessary for further action in her new capacity of Woland's associate.

Woland arguably knows Margarita's thoughts, but asks her all the same: "Ну, что же, смелее! — поощрял Воланд" (Bulgakov 1990, 274). It can be argued that Woland understands what Margarita is thinking from the narrator's description: "Потребовать, потребовать, моя донна, — отвечал Воланд, понимающе улыбаясь, — потребовать одной вещи" (Bulgakov 1990, 274). The narrator at least understands that Woland can read Margarita's interior monologue. This knowledge displays some knowledge of the rules of the test that Woland applies to Margarita.

Margarita's dialogue with Woland concerning Frida's fate displays Margarita's assimilation of the internal monologue of the Other. In this short

dialogue, a section of the whole dialogue of the chapter, Frida is the Other. Her interior monologue enters Margarita's thoughts:

> Дух перехватило у Маргариты, и она уже хотела выговорить заветные и приготовленные в душе слова, как вдруг побледнела, раскрыла рот и вытаращила глаза. «Фрида! Фрида! Фрида! — прокричал ей в уши чей-то назойливый, молящий голос. — Меня зовут Фрида!» (Булгаков 1990, 274)

Although at this point Margarita is not in dialogue with Frida, Frida's voice nevertheless penetrates Margarita's dialogue with Woland. Margarita, though, willingly allowed such penetration when she gave her word to Frida during the ball to secure her release.

According to Woland's dialogue he is clearly surprised by Margarita's action:

> — Я о милосердии говорю, — объяснил свои слова Воланд, не спуская с Маргариты огненного глаза. — Иногда совершенно неожиданно и коварно оно пролезает в самые узенькие щелки. (Булгаков 1990, 274)

It is only through Woland's dialogue that the reader can see that even Woland can sometimes be surprised by Margarita. The dialogue can also aid in pinpointing the level of Margarita's development. Although the ball taught her much, she still hasn't realized that she herself has the power to free Frida. Similar to Chapter 22, Korov'ev has to prompt her: "Ну, Фрида... — подсказал Коровьев" (Bulgakov 1990, 275).

When Begemot interrupts Woland, the reply is: "Молчи, черт тебя возьми! — сказал ему Воланд и продолжал, обращаясь к Маргарите..." (Bulgakov 1990, 275). Whereas Begemot freely interrupted Woland's conversation with Margarita in Chapter 22, when Woland was deciding her fate, such interruptions have no place now that her fate has already been decided. This is an instance of where the dialogue takes on a greater importance. It is a representation of the process itself of Woland deciding the fate of Margarita and the Master.

3.4 Chapter 29: "Судьба мастера и Маргариты определена"

A third important dialogue with great significance for the metaphysical interpretation of the novel is the dialogue between Woland and Levij Matvej in Chapter 24, "Судьба мастера и Маргариты определена."

The beginning of the chapter contains a dialogue between Woland and Azazello, in which Woland asks questions and Azazello answers:

> Азазелло, расставшись со своим современным нарядом...одетый, как и Воланд, в черное, неподвижно стоял невдалеке от своего повелителя, так же как и он не спуская глаз с города.
>
> Воланд заговорил:
>
> — Какой интересный город, не правда ли?
>
> Азазелло шевельнулся и ответил почтительно:
>
> — Мессир, мне больше нравится Рим.
>
> — Да, это дело вкуса, — ответил Воланд.
>
> Через некоторое время опять раздался его голос:
>
> — А отчего этот дым там, на бульваре?
>
> — Это горит Грибоедов, — ответил Азазелло.
>
> — Надо полагать, что это наразлучная пара, Коровьев и Бегемот, побывала там?
>
> — В этом нет никакого сомнения, мессир. (Булгаков 1990, 349)

This exchange is formal, almost ritualistic. Its purpose is arguably not to provide Woland with information he does not have. Throughout the novel Woland is omniscient concerning events in the novel. Because there is no new information presented in the dialogue it becomes necessary to ask why it is included. In the *sjužet* of the novel, this section is very close to Chapter 32, "Прощение и вечный уют," in which Margarita finally sees Woland and his suite in their true forms. The proximity to that point determines the character of Chapter 29. In Chapter 29 the true nature of Woland and Azazello becomes apparent. They are no longer dressed in their modern clothes, but rather in medieval garments, probably hearkening back to a time when questions of God and fate held the uppermost place in humanity's consciousness. The lack of new information in the dialogue is echoed by the description in the text that Woland and Azazello stood "неподвижно." The lack of physical movement is an echo of the lack of movement of new information. Although there is a slight movement when the narrator says: "Азазелло шевельнулся...," that movement is very brief. The true nature of

Azazello's relationship to Woland, that of the demon to the Prince of Darkness, is suggested by the use of the words *повелителя*, *почтительно*.

When Woland conducts his conversation with Azazello, he first asks his minion to confirm the statement that Moscow is an interesting city. Azazello does not answer the question but instead states he prefers Rome. The cross purpose answer to this question is a signal that the questioning and answering is not about conveying information. Woland is giving Azazello the instructions to kill Margarita and the Master and burn their apartment. Woland has decided their fate even before the conversation with Levij Matvej. The timing indicates that Woland is fully aware of what must be done and has a full understanding of fate.

The part concerning the destruction of the Griboedov house by fire follows. Woland is most likely aware of what the smoke is from and that the destruction is the work of Korov'ev and Begemot. Why, then, would Woland ask Azazello for information that Woland already has?

Harold D. Baker's (1998) examination of two types of dialogue: Socratic and hermetic, may be applicable in explaining this dialogue between Woland and Azazello. Baker states:

> As we will see, for Bulgakov dialogue controls not only the becoming of the individual soul but even in some sense the nature of ultimate truth (as is particularly evident in its closing, "metaphysical" interlocutions)....
>
> The variety of compositional dialogues in *The Master and Margarita* is considerable, yet those most interesting for their structure as dialogues fall into two groups, which we can call the Socratic and Hermetic. In the Socratic dialogue one interlocutor leads the other toward some conclusion by way of a series of distinct logical steps, presuming only a particular experience of reality and striving to challenge the conclusions the passive interlocutor draws from that experience. The Hermetic dialogue, by contrast, depends on a deep context of shared knowledge between the interlocutors, proceeds by hints or even by a kind of private code, and is concerned with some practical action to be undertaken or decision to be made. The Socratic dialogue is explicit, discursive, and speculative; the Hermetic is allusive, laconic, and practical. (Baker 1998, 55)

It is possible that the dialogue between Woland and Azazello is, in fact, a Hermetic dialogue. It seems that Woland is leading Azazello to a certain conclusion. Woland's dialogue with Azazello does contain a "context of shared knowledge between the interlocutors" (Baker 1998, 55). In this case it is the shared knowledge that the Griboedov house is burning and that Korov'ev and Begemot are responsible for the fire. Hermetic dialogue "is concerned with some practical action to be undertaken or decision to be made" (Baker 1998, 55). In this chapter the fate of Margarita and the Master is decided. That decision is carried out in the next chapter, when Azazello visits the couple, poisons them, destroys their apartment by fire and brings them to Woland and his suite who are preparing for departure for the next world. Those instructions may be contained in the small section of dialogue where Woland and Azazello discuss the fire engulfing the Griobedov house. The Griboedov house is a symbol of materialism and corruption, and so Woland destroys it. The Master and Margarita cannot live their lives further in freedom without fear, so those lives and that which remains after them must be destroyed.

In the following dialogue, between Woland and Levij Matvej, the narrator once again does not display any formal characteristics of existence. The narrator also takes a position that echoes Woland's point of view:

> Глаз Воланда горел точно так же, как одно из таких окон, хотя Воланд был спиною к закату.
>
> Но тут что-то заставило Воланда отвернуться от города и обратить свое внимание на круглую башню, которая была у него за спиною на крыше. (Булгаков 1990, 349)

The narrator places emphasis on Woland's physical position, twice mentioning which way he was facing. The narrator does not seem to initially know when caused Woland to turn in the other direction. The cause for Woland's movement is the arrival of Levij Matvej. If the narrator were facing in the same direction as Woland, he would not know the specific reason, namely Levij Matvej's arrival, that caused Woland to turn, until he himself had turned. This is regardless whether Woland knew or not what caused him to turn, because the narrator, facing in the same direction as Woland, would

himself not have this information, or else purposefully withhold it to cause the reader to notice his position.

The first part of the dialogue between Woland and Levij Matvej is a debate on the nature of good and evil. Levij Matvej accuses Woland of being evil, a charge that Woland does not necessarily deny but rather puts into perspective. Woland does not cause needless destruction and suffering, which is the representative task of Abadonna who embodies the violence of human beings, but rather Woland's actions are punitive. This dialogue fits the description offered by Baker of a Socratic dialogue, in which Woland tries to lead Levij Matvej to an understanding of this truth through logical argument:

> — Ба! — воскликнул Воланд, с насмешкой глядя на вошедшего. — Менее всего можно было ожидать тебя здесь! Ты с чем пожаловал, незваный, но предвиденный гость?
>
> — Я к тебе, дух зла и повелитель теней, ответил вошедший, исподлобья недружелюбно глядя на Воланда.
>
> — Если ты ко мне, то почему же ты не поздоровался со мной, бывший сборщик податей? — заговорил Воланд сурово.
>
> — Потому что я не хочу, чтобы ты здравствовал, — ответил дерзко вошедший.
>
> — Но тебе придется примириться с этим, — возразил Воланд, и усмешка искривила его рот, — не успел ты появиться на крыше, как уже сразу отвесил нелепость, и я тебе скажу, в чем она, — в твоих интонациях. Ты произнес свои слова так, как будто ты не признаешь теней, а также и зла. Не будешь ли ты так добр подумать над вопросом: что бы делало твое добро, если бы не существовало зла, и как бы выглядела земля, если бы с нее исчезли тени? Ведь тени получаются от предметов и людей. Вот тень от моей шпаги. Но бывают тени от деревьев и от живых существ. Не хочешь ли ты ободрать весь земной шар, снеся с него прочь все деревья и все живое из-за твоей фантазии наслаждаться голым светом? Ты глуп. (Булгаков 1990, 348-9)

In this dialogue the author reverses the traditional roles of the two sides represented. Here it is the devil who is kinder and more polite than the representative of Iešua, Levij Matvej. The author uses this opportunity to illustrate a wider reality of the novel. Woland and his suite of demons are not 'evil' in the traditional sense, but rather fulfill a special role of punishing

the wicked. When Levij Matvej greets Woland with anger and bitterness the author uses irony to make his point. Woland, in fact, argues for a more unified and humanistic understanding of the cosmic order. Woland's arguments seem reasonable and Levij Matvej's seem unreasonable.

In the second part of the dialogue, Woland ceases to try to convince Levij Matvej of the validity of his arguments. Instead they turn to the matter at hand: the fate of Margarita and the Master:

> — Я не буду с тобою спорить, старый софист, — ответил Левий Матвей.
>
> — Ты и не можешь со мной спорить, по той причине, о которой я уже упомянул: ты глуп, — ответил Воланд и спросил: — Ну, говори кратко, не утомляя меня, зачем появился?
>
> — Он прислал меня.
>
> — Что же он велел передать тебе, раб?
>
> — Я не раб, — все более озлобляясь, ответил Левий Матвей, — я его ученик.
>
> — Мы говорим с тобой на разных языках, как всегда, — отозвался Воланд, — но вещи, о которых мы говорим, от этого не меняются. Итак?..
>
> — Он прочитал сочинение мастера, заговорил Левий Матвей, — и просит тебя, чтобы ты взял с собою мастера и наградил его покоем. Неужели это трудно тебе сделать, дух зла?
>
> — Мне ничего не трудно сделать, — ответил Воланд, — и тебе это хорошо известно. — Он помолчал и добавил: — А что же вы не берете его к себе, в свет?
>
> — Он не заслужил света, он заслужил покой, — печальным голосом проговорил Левий.
>
> — Передай, что будет сделано, ответил Воланд и прибавил, причем глаз его вспыхнул: — И покинь меня немедленно.
>
> — Он просит, чтобы ту, которая любила и страдала из-за него, вы взяли бы тоже, — в первый раз моляще обратился Левий к Воланду.
>
> — Без тебя мы никак не догадались об этом. Уходи. (Булгаков 1990, 350)

In this half of the dialogue Woland finally looses his patience and treats Levij Matvej with scorn, calling Levij Matvej 'stupid' and 'slave.' The author's portrayal of Levij Matvej as angry continues by using the gerund "озлобляясь" to describe Levij Matvej's reaction. Levij Matvej's position in

the dialogue is held in a consistent position, meaning that the author represents Levij Matvej as arguing with Woland unsuccessfully. When Levij Matvej explains what the Master has deserved, his voice is described as "печальным." When discussing Margarita, Levij Matvej's voice is "моляще." Here, as in other dialogues, the narrator does not intrude. Instead, the narrator conveys the dialogue efficiently and with a minimum of description and subjective observation. This scene may be outside the scope of the normal narrator. Like Woland's dialogues with Margarita, in the dialogue with Levij Matvej Woland is closer to his true, otherworldly self than when he puts on a figurative mask when dealing with Berlioz, Bezdomnyj and the Moscow audience. At such times, as during the Eršalaim chapters, the narrator's own voice becomes silent and the author allows the narrative voice that remains to make slight, subtle comments. At the end of the novel there are two very important dialogues: the dialogue between Woland and Azazello in which Woland informs Azazello of his decision of Margarita's and the Master's fate, and the dialogue on the nature of good and evil between Woland and Levij Matvej. The dialogue between Woland and Azazello is a Hermetic dialogue. Similar to Pilate's instructions to Afranij, Woland instructs Azazello to kill Margarita and Master and burn the apartment without overtly stating so. Woland and Azezello's common base of knowledge and protocols enable them to effectively communicate through an almost ritualized discourse.

The dialogue between Woland and Levij Matvej, similar to that at the beginning of the novel between Woland and Berlioz and Bezdomnyj, is a Socratic dialogue. Woland tries to show Levij Matvej the true nature of good and evil through logical argumentation and questioning, but Levij Matvej cannot be led to the truth.

3.5 Conclusions to the Chapter

The multi-layered nature of dialogue in Bulgakov's works is similar to that of Dostoevskij's. The methods, however are different, and include

subtext, the thematic connection of dialogues that follow one after another, and orientation of dialogue and various traditions.

The difference between *Master i Margarita* and Dostoevskij's works is that the debate ends. The interlocutors are not on equal terms. Furthermore, in *Master i Margarita*, the debate ends with the destruction of one of the interlocutors in one form or another, that is to say the development of the *sjužet* and the fate of the protagonists depends on their ability to engage in dialogue and, specifically, the kinds of dialogue that the protagonists chose in their communication with Woland and his suite. In Berlioz's and Baron Majgel''s case, that destruction takes the form of death. In Ivan Bezdomnyj's case dialogue with Woland causes him to change his identity through changing his name, taking a new profession and a different set of beliefs, markedly different from those of the atheistic, materialist Communist poet. In Margarita's and the Master's case it takes the form of death and transfiguration.

4. Dialogue with the Devil through Baxtin's Interpretation in the Works of Dostoevskij and Bulgakov

4.1 Introduction: Dialogue with the Devil in Literary Tradition

The Middle Ages sees the appearance of the first major works of Slavic literature. Among them are the *žitija*. The appearance of Christian literary works marks, along with the Bible, the beginning of literary fascination with the devil. There are several works concerning Bulgakov and the devil in literature. Vladimir Tumanov (1989) examines the reactions of various critics such as A. Colin Wright and Jamie Curtis to Woland and continues to compare Woland with other characters of Russian literature.

Elisabeth Steinbock-Fermor's article "Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* and Goethe's *Faust*" (1969) examines the most prominent literary association of Woland, that with Mephistopheles of Goethe's *Faust*. The author also mentions the importance of the devil of Gounod's opera *Faust*, which had profound influence on Bulgakov. Even from his childhood in Kyjiv Bulgakov was enamored with Gounod's creation. This specific connection is further explored in depth by David Low in "Gounod's *Faust* and Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*" (1996).

Edythe C. Haber of the University of Massachusetts at Boston published an article entitled "Dwellings and Devils in Early Bulgakov" (1993) which does touch upon the significance of Woland in *Master i Margarita*. Through an examination of Bulgakov's earlier use of the demonic it is possible to see the development of Woland based on previous literary usages.

Outside of the Russian literary tradition, Goethe's *Faust* is perhaps the most famous work where the devil figures prominently. Goethe's work is one of many works on the same theme, which includes novels, stories, poems, symphonies and operas. Goethe's *Faust* directly inspired Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*. The influence of Goethe's *Faust* has been the subject of many studies and falls outside the scope of this study.

In Russian literature perhaps the most famous work involving conversation with the devil is Dostoevskij's *Brat'ja Karamazovy*. Both

Dostoevskij and Bulgakov deal with questions of religion and the meaning of life in unusual ways. The devil is an integral part in that process.

Vladislav Krasnov's "Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* in Light of Baxtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*" examines *Master i Margarita* is in terms of Menippean satire as formulated by Baxtin. A Menippea is a work in which "The most daring and unrestrained fantasy and adventure are...motivated and justified by a pure philosophical purpose" (96). Trying to locate Bulgakov in relation to Baxtin and Dostoevskij has been a major enterprise for researchers of Bulgakov, and this article is valuable in providing one more perspective, one that penetrates into a specific area of Bulgakov-Baxtin-Dostoevskij relations.

4.2 Dialogue with the Devil in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* and *Master i Margarita*

Bulgakov would certainly have been familiar with Dostoevskij, considering Dostoevskij's position in the pantheon of Russian authors. Harold D. Baker's work "Socratic, Hermetic, and Internally Convincing Dialogue: Types of Interlocution in Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*" (1998) touches upon Baxtin's theory of "internally convincing discourse" from Baxtin's work "Discourse in the Novel" (Baker 1998, 63-4). Baker deals with the larger, superdialogic issues of Baxtin's work.

Especially important is Dostoevskij's interest in morality and religion. Because of the similar thematic of both Bulgakov's and Dostoevskij's work, it is most likely that Bulgakov would have to engage in some sort of artistic dialogue with Dostoevskij.

In *Brat'ja Karamazovy*, the devil is a representative of this moral code. This is also true in *Master i Margarita*. The methods the two devils use to represent the absolute moral code are also similar — it is through Socratic (as opposed to Hermetic) dialogue and through a interweaving of the mortal interlocutor's internal monologue with his own speech. The two devils inevitably intertwine a spiritual world-view with their dialogues, suggesting

that the highest, objective authority and standard lies on the spiritual plane, in direct contradiction to the materialist world-view.

The two devils are similar in many ways. Like Bulgakov's consistent identification of Woland with a foreigner, especially a German, Dostoevskij also describes his devil as a foreigner, specifically an Englishmen, often using the term *džentl'men*. However, this similarity is superficial. Dostoevskij's devil is clearly meant to be Russian:

> Похоже было на то, что джентльмен принадлежит к разряду бывших булоручек-помещиков, процветавших еще при крепостном праве; очевидно видавший свет и порядочное общество, имевший когда-то связи и сохранивший их, пожалуй, и до сих пор, но мало-помалу с обеднением после веселой жизни в молодости и недавней отмены крепостного права обратившийся вроде как бы в приживальщика хорошего тона... (Достоевский 1963, 345)

Here a significant shift in narrative strategies becomes visible. In *Master i Margarita* the narrator is never allowed by the author to treat Woland with irony. However, in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*, the narrator treats the devil with irony. The result of this shift in strategy is that the devil seems less authoritative. Woland is always treated with respectful distance by the narrator of *Master i Margarita*, emphasizing that he is above the standards of judgment to which the other characters are subject. The narrator's treatment of the devil with irony lowers his position in relation to the other characters. The identification of the devil as a foreigner, both by Bulgakov and Dostoevskij, serves to enhance the position of the devil as the Other, with the Other being an essential part of dialogue in Dostoevskij's works according to Baxtin. Bulgakov preserves that essential position for the Other — Woland — in his own novel.

The first similarity can be seen on the most external level of all — the way they dress. Dostoevskij's narrator describes his devil:

> Одет он был в какой-то коричневый пиджак, очевидно от лучшего портного, но уже поношенный, сшитый примерно еще третьего года и совершенно уже вышедший из моды, так что из светских достаточных людей таких уже два года никто не носил. Белье, длинный галстук в виде шарфа, все было так, как у всех шиковатых джентельменов, но белье, если

> вглядеться ближе, было грязновато, а широкий шарф очень потерт. Клетчатые панталоны гостя сидели превосходно, но были опять-таки слишком светлы и как-то слишком узки, как теперь уже перестали носить, равно как и мягкая белая пуховая шляпа, которую уже слишком не по сезону притащил с собой гость. (Достоевский 1963, 345)

The narrator in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* makes it evident that the devil is closely tied to Ivan's consciousness. Although Woland has knowledge of the other characters' thoughts, the devil in Dostoevskij actually echoes Ivan's thoughts:

> — Браня тебя, себя браню! — опять засмеялся Иван,— ты — я, сам я, только с другою рожей. Ты именно говоришь то, что я уже мыслю... и ничего не в силах сказать мне нового! (Достоевский 1963, 348)

As the Other, this devil is directly responsible for echoing Ivan's thoughts and for 'justifying' Ivan's position. Woland never has such a responsibility. He never echoes the thoughts of other characters, only makes it known that he is aware of them.

Dostoevskij's devil combines two aspects that Woland displays at different times. The first is that of being well dressed. When Woland first appears he is impeccably dressed. Furthermore, Woland is not dressed according to the season: "Англичанин...— подумал Берлиоз. — Ишь, и не жарко ему в перчатках" (Bulgakov 1990, 11). As quoted above, Dostoevskij's devil is not dressed according to the season and his clothes, although worn and outmoded, are ornate and were once high style.

Dostoevskij's devil is also described as wearing checkered pants: "Клетчатые панталоны гостя сидели превосходно, но были опять-таки слишком светлы и как-то слишком узки, как теперь уже перестали носить..." (Dostoevskij 1963, 345). The demon-knight Korov'ev is partly characterized as wearing checkered clothes. In Chapter 28, "Последние похождения Коровьева и Бегемота," the narrator states:

> Где они разделились, мы также не можем сказать, но мы знаем, что примерно через четверть часа после начала пожара на Садовой, у зеркальных дверей торгсина на Смоленском рынке появился длинный гражданин в

клетчатом костюме и с ним черный крупный кот. (Булгаков 1990, 336)

In this statement, Begemot is identified by his being a large black cat. Korov'ev is identified as being a 'citizen in a checkered suit' — the only way the reader has to infer that the person described is, in fact Korov'ev, is by the fact that he is wearing the checkered suit. Further in the same chapter, that significance is repeated:

> Арчибальд Арчибальдович знал и о сеансе в Варьете, и о многих других происшествиях этих дней, слышал, но, в противоположность другим, мимо ушей не пропустил ни слова «клетчатый», ни слова «кот». Арчибальд Арчибальдович сразу догадался, кто его посетители. (Булгаков 1990, 346)

Here, as the reader earlier in the chapter had to make the judgment that the male citizen described by the narrator accompanying the cat is Korov'ev based on the description of that citizen wearing a checkered suit, so here Arčibal'd Arčibal'dovič makes the same judgment based on the same information quickly and assuredly. In this chapter it may be significant that Korov'ev chooses Dostoevskij when mentioning an 'immortal writer.' Dostoevskij is also held up as an example of a true writer, perhaps because, like Bulgakov, Dostoevskij was concerned with truth, morality and the spiritual world in his works:

> Так вот, чтобы убедиться в том, что Достоевский — писатель, неужели же нужно спрашивать у него удостоверение? Да возьмите вы любых пять страниц из любого его романа, и без всякого удостоверения вы убедитесь, что имеете дело с писателем. Да я полагаю, что у него и дувостоверения-то никакого не было! Как ты думаешь? — обратился Коровьев к Бегемоту.
>
> — Пари держу, что не было, — ответил тот, ставая примус на стол рядом с книгой и вытирая пот рукою на закопченном лбу.
>
> — Вы — не Достоевский, — сказала гражданка, сбиваемая с толку Коровьевым.
>
> — Ну, почем знать, почем знать, — ответил тот.
>
> — Достоевский умер, — сказала гражданка, но как-то не очень уверенно.
>
> — Протестую! — горячо воскликнул Бегемот. — Достоевский бессмертен! (Булгаков 1990, 343)

Dostoevskij's devil also wears a long tie: "Белье, длинный галстук в виде шарфа, все было так, как у всех шиковатых джентельменов" (Dostoevskij 1963, 345). This provides resonance with the description of Begemot's tie when preparing for the ball:

> Теперь на шее у кота оказался белый фрачный галстук бантиком, а на груди перламутровый дамский бинокль на ремешке. Кроме того, усы у кота были позолочены.
>
> — Ну что же это такое! — воскликнул Воланд, — зачем ты позолотил усы? И на кой черт тебе нужен галстух, если на тебе нет штанов?
>
> — Штаны коту не полагаются, мессир, — с большим достоинством отвечал кот, — уж не прикажете ли вы мне надеть и сапоги? Кот в сапогах бывает только в сказках, мессир. Но видели ли вы когда-либо кого-нибудь на балу без галстуха? Я не намерен оказаться в комическом положении и рисковать тем, что меня вытолкают в шею! Каждый украшает себя, чем может. Считайте, что сказанное относится и к биноклю, мессир! (Булгаков 1990, 247-8)

In Dostoevskij's description of his devil every item of clothing in the detailed and deliberate description corresponds with an item of clothing mentioned in *Master i Margarita*. A relatively significant amount of space in *Master i Margarita* is given over to Begemot's tie. The tie that Dostoevskij's devil wears can evoke irony because it is very long and worn like a scarf. Similarly, Begemot's tie is an object of irony, because, as Woland notes, it is absurd for a cat to wear a tie, which Begemot defends while at the same time ridiculing the idea that a cat should wear boots.

One of the characteristics of the *džentl'men* described by Dostoevskij's narrator as the type to which his devil might belong was the willingness to sit down to a came of cards: "Такие приживальщики, складного характера джентльмены, умеющие порассказать, составить партию в карты..." (Dostoevskij 1963, 345). In Chapter 22, "При свечах" of *Master i Margarita*, there is extensive game imagery, specifically cards and chess. Korov'ev says:

> И если бы расспросить некоторых прабабушек и в особенности тех из них, что пользовались репутацией смиренниц, удивительнейшие тайны открылись бы,

> уважаемая Маргарита Николаевна. Я ничуть не погрешу, если, говоря об этом, упомяну о причудливо тасуемой колоде карт. Есть вещи, в которых совершенно недействительны ни сословные перегородки, ни даже границы между государствами. (Булгаков 1990, 245)

In this statement, the metaphor of the deck of cards is made conditional upon speaking about the secrets of Margarita's ancestor. Ostensibly these are questions of fidelity and the legitimacy of family lines, which is also a theme in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*. Korov'ev and Dostoevskij's devil are doubly linked in these two passages by the imagery of cards and by references to the immoral natures of human beings. In *Master i Margarita* the metaphor is further reinforced by Woland, who says: "Да, прав Коровьев. Как причудливо тасуется колода! Кровь!" (Bulgakov 1990, 247).

4.3 Woland's Rheumatism

In the conversations of the devils of Dostoevskij and Bulgakov there is the common thread of rheumatism. This ailment is mentioned by Dostoevskij's devil:

> Пожалуй, не отвечай. Теперь вот ревматизмы опять пошли...
> — Дурака—повторил опять Иван.
> — Ты все свое, а я вот такой ревматизм прошлого года схватил, что до сих пор вспоминаю.
> — У чёрта ревматизм?
> — Почему же и нет, если я иногда воплощаюсь. Воплощаюсь, так п принимаю последствия. Сатана sum et nihil humanum a me alienum puto.[1]
> — Как, как? Сатана sum et nihil humanum... это неглупо для черта!
> — Рад, что наконец угодил.
> — А ведь это ты взял не у меня,—остановился вдруг Иван, как бы пораженный,—это мне никогда в голову но приходило, это странно...
> — C'est du nouveau n'est ce pas?[2] На этот раз я поступлю честно и объясню тебе. Слушай: в снах, и особенно в кошмарах, ну там от расстройства желудка или чего-нибудь, иногда видит человек такие художественные сны, такую сложную и реальную действительность, такие события или даже целый мир событий, связанный такою интригой с

[1] Я сатана, и ничто человеческое мне не чуждо *(лат.)*.
[2] Это ново, не правда ли? *(франц.)*

> такими неожиданными подробностями, начиная с высших ваших проявлений до последней пуговицы на манишке... (Достоевский 1963, 349-50)

Rheumatism has a special significance in this context. The devil uses rheumatism as a link to the experience of being human and understanding humanity. Woland suffers from a similar affliction:

> С Азазелло и Коровьевым вы уже познакомились, служанку мою Геллу рекомендую. Расторопна, понятлива, и нет такой услуги, которую она не сумела бы оказать.
>
> Красавица Гелла улыбаясь, обратив к Маргарите свои с зеленью глаза, не переставая зачерпывать пригоршней мазь и накладывать ее на колено....
>
> — Позвольте мне, — тихо попросила Маргарита.
>
> Воланд пристально поглядел на нее и пододвинул к ней колено.
>
> Горячая, как лава, жижа обжигала руки, но Маргарита, не морщась, стараясь не причинять боли, втирала ее в колено.
>
> — Приближенные утверждают, что это ревматизм, — говорил Воланд, не спуская глаз с Маргариты, — но я сильно подозреваю, что эта боль в колене оставлена мне на память одной очаровательной ведьмой, с которой я близко познакомился в тысяча пятьсот семьдесят первом году в Брокенских горах, на Чертовой кафедре.
>
> — Ах, может ли это быть! — сказала Маргарита.
>
> — Вздор! Лет через триста это пройдет. Мне посоветовали множество лекарств, но я по старинке придерживаюсь бабушкиных средств. Поразительные травы оставила в наследство поганая старушка, моя бабушка! Кстати, скажите, а вы не страдаете чем-нибудь? Быть может, у вас есть какая-нибудь печаль, отравляющая душу тоска? (Булгаков 1990, 248-51)

Woland's statement serves to continue the theme of the devil's human traits begun by Dostoevskij's devil. Although they are clearly representatives of a different realm, the two devils take on human characteristics and, at the same time, suffering. In Dostoevskij's work, the devil closely follows the thoughts of Ivan. His rheumatism is possibly a metaphor for Ivan's own sickness and internal problems. In Woland, too, it is a representation of his connection to humanity. In Woland's case the rheumatism is directly linked to the witch on Brocken Mountain. D. I. Pisarev states:

> Гейне в одном из своих посмертных стихотворений говорит, что мир представляется молодою красавицею или брокенскою ведьмою, смотря по тому, через какие очки на него взглянуть — через выпуклые или через вогнутые. (Писарев 1955, 274)

The 'Brocken witch' is most likely what Woland was alluding to when suggesting a reason for his rheumatism, as cited above. Certainly Bulgakov would have been familiar with the writings of Pisarev. The purpose of the inclusion of the Brocken witch into *Master i Margarita* has special significance, especially when discussed in the context of Dostoevskij. The cluster of references to external texts — Dostoevskij and Heine — create a zone in which the consciousness of the reader is advised of the presence of the references, like a tripwire. The theme of the nature of good and evil in the world binds all three texts.

In Pisarev's article the image of glasses are the metaphoric vehicle for describing different views of the world. Glasses are also a prominent image, not only in Pisarev's text and Heine's poem, but also in *Master i Margarita*. Abadonna wears glasses as a symbol of his impartiality in administering violence to all sides of conflict. Korov'ev himself often wears a monocle. When describing their place in the order of the world, Woland states:

> — Ни в коем случае, — ответил Воланд, — дело в том, дорогая королева, что тут произошла маленькая путаница. Каждое ведомство должно заниматься своими делами. Не спорю, наши возможности довольно велики, они гораздо больше, чем полагают некоторые, не очень зоркие люди...
>
> — Да, уж гораздо больше, — не утерпел и вставил кот, видимо гордящийся этими возможностями.
>
> — Молчи, черт тебя возьми! — сказал ему Воланд и продолжал, обращаясь к Маргарите: — Но просто, какой смысл в том, чтобы сделать то, что полагается делать другому, как я выразился, ведомству? Итак, я этого делать не буду, а вы сделайте сами. (Булгаков 1990, 275)

Here again is the imagery of sight connected with fate and conduct. Begemot carries binoculars and accentuates the word *zorkij*. These signs are directly linked to the powers and abilites of Woland and his suite. Whereas in

Pisarev's work the glasses determine a person's perception of the world, Abadonna's glasses prevent him from perceiving the world. Pisarev continues to state: "Поневоле придется...обратить все свое внимание па грешного человека, который здесь, 'как и везде, или сам страдает, или выезжает на страданиях другого.'" (Pisarev 1955, 274). A resonance is created with the major themes of *Master i Margarita*, where Woland and his suite turn their attention on sinful people who either themselves suffer or operate on the suffering of others. Whether or not Bulgakov, through his most likely familiarity with the works of Pisarev, intended this resonance, it is nevertheless created through Bulgakov's reference to the Brocken witch, an image that evokes both Heine and Pisarev, who interprets Heine.

In discussing the effect of turning one's attention onto such people, Pisarev continues to describe what one might see:

> Как посмотришь на людские отношения, как послушаешь разнородных суждений, словесных, рукописных и печатных, как вглядишься в то впечатление, которое производят эти суждения, то мысль о выпуклых очках и о красавице отлетит на неизмеримо далекое расстояние. (Писарев 1955, 274)

When looking upon human relationships, Pisarev's addressee will hear various judgements of the literary, handwritten and printed, and when the addressee looks at the impression created by these judgments, then the meaning of the concave classes and about the beautiful woman will fly into the distance. It is clear that Pisarev does not hold a very high opinion about people's capacity to treat one another decently. Such an opinion is analogous to Bulgakov's, which is expressed in *Master i Margarita*.

Bulgakov, as a satirist, shows his audience the world as he sees it through 'convex glasses', the world analogous to the Brocken witch. The view of the world as analogous to the witch, rather than the beautiful woman, is, in Pisarev's opinion, justified by observation. In *Master i Margarita* it is Woland who serves as the impartial judge who is able to point out the facts of the matter, that people often behave badly in their relations with one another. Woland's position in this complex hierarchy is reinforced by the fact that he came to know the witch closely and that she left him the

pain in memory of her. Like the human beings he helps, the Master and Margarita, Woland is also left in pain by the world. Being left in pain by the world and people who act cruelly and selfishly is also a characteristic of Bulgakov. Woland functions as an expression of Bulgakov's pain from the ugliness of the world, of which the Borcken witch is a metaphor, with which Bulgakov was well acquainted, similarly to Woland and the witch.

Woland's and his suite's position is, however, different from that of the mortal characters in the novel. Because they are a part of the supernatural world, at the top of the hierarchy of power, they are not vulnerable to the world, even though it does give Woland pain. Pisarev, in his evaluation of Heine's work, offers the human reaction he imagines:

> Уродливые черты брокенской ведьмы явятся перед глазами с такою ужасающею яркостью и отчетливостью, что иному юному наблюлдателю сделается не на шутку страшно; он быстро проведет рукою по глазам, в надежде сорвать проклятые очки и разогнать ненавистную галлюцинацию; но галлюцинация останется ярка попрежпему, и юный наблюдатель заметит не без волнения, что вогнутые очки срослись с его глазами и что ему придется зажмуриться, чтобы не видать тех образов, которые пугают его воображение. (Писарев 1955, 274-5)

There is another resonance between Bulgakov created by this passage. Here, in extending the metaphor of the Brocken witch, Pisarev mentions 'the monstrous devils of the Brocken witch,' that 'appears before the eyes.' Although the devils of Woland's suite are not connected to the Brocken witch, they do, nevertheless, serve a common purpose. That purpose is Bulgakov's satire, the purpose of which is to expose the faults of humanity, as does Woland and his suite, most notably in the Var'ete Theater. The equation of the vision of truth with hallucination is a theme present in *Master i Margarita*. When Woland first extracts the Master from the psychiatric clinic, the Master says:

> Не плачь, Марго, не терзай меня. Я тяжко болен. — Он ухватился за подоконник рукою, как бы собираясь вскочить на него и бежать, оскалил зубы, всматриваясь в сидящих, и закричал: — Мне страшно, Марго! У меня опять начались галлюцинации... (Булгаков 1990, 276)

The Master's reactions can be equated with those of the hypothetical young man in Pisarev's article. Both figures are seized by fear and take what they see for hallucinations. However, those 'hallucinations' are actually insights into the reality of the world, however cruel they may seem. Bulgakov's satire, like Pisarev's glasses, are the means to display that truth in an attempt to make it better. However, fear is a necessary catalyst. Hallucination and sickness are also themes in Ivan's conversation with the devil, in which hallucination is mentioned three times. The first time is when the doctor examines Ivan:

> Доктор, выслушав и осмотрев его, заключил, что у него в роде даже как бы расстройства в мозгу, и нисколько не удивился некоторому признанию, которое тот с отвращением однако сделал ему. «Галлюцинации в вашем состоянии очень возможны, решил доктор, хотя надо бы их и проверить... вообще же необходимо начать лечение серьезно, не теряя ни минуты, не то будет плохо». (Достоевский 1963, 344)

As Baxtin pointed out earlier, Ivan is trying to decide upon the state of his moral health — did he wish for his father's death? Was he a factor somehow in his father's death? Simultaneously, on a more physical level, which may be symptomatic of the moral, Ivan is trying to determine whether or not he is sick. Similarly, the Master's work, like Bulgakov's, is an attempt to determine the nature of reality using art. When Woland summons the Master, the Master struggles to determine if what is seeing is real. The Master must also grapple with his own moral culpability in the fact of his cowardice. He renounced his calling when persecuted. Woland serves as the point of clarification of the Master's shortcoming.

Later in Ivan Karamazov's conversation with his devil, Ivan Karamazov tries to explain the devil away as a hallucination. Both devils are a source of discomfort. Ivan Karamazov's devil causes discomfort because, in Ivan Karamazov's perception, he tries to lead Ivan away from moral reasoning, to tempt him. The devil the Master faces causes discomfort because he is in a position to judge the Master for cowardice. Ivan Karamazov tries to negate his devil's existence:

> Ты ложь, ты болезнь моя, ты призрак. Я только не знаю, чем тебя истребить, и вижу, что некоторое время надобно пострадать. Ты моя галлюцинация. Ты воплощение меня самого, только одной впрочем моей стороны... моих мыслей и чувств, только самых гадких и глупых. С этой стороны ты мог бы быть даже мне любопытен, если бы только мне было время с тобой возиться... (Достоевский 1963, 344)

Ivan Karamzov wishes to believe that his devil is a devil of lies, whereas Margarita explains to the Master that the devil before them is a devil of truth. Both the Master and Ivan Karamzov wish to be rid of the devils they equate with hallucinations. The Master states:

> — Вы знаете, с кем вы сейчас говорите, — спросил у пришедшего Воланд, — у кого вы находитесь?
>
> — Знаю, — ответил мастер, — моим соседом в сумасшедшем доме был этот мальчик Иван Бездомный. Он рассказал мне о вас.
>
> — Как же, как же, — отозвался Воланд, — я имел удовольствие встретиться с этим молодым человеком на Патриарших прудах. Он едва самого меня не свел с ума, доказывая мне, что меня нету! Но вы-то верите, что это действительно я?
>
> — Приходится верить, — сказал пришелец, — но, конечно, гораздо спокойнее было бы считать вас плодом галлюцинации. Извините меня, — спохватившись, прибавил мастер. (Булгаков 1990, 278)

The Master, like Ivan Karamazov, becomes convinced that the devil is real. Even though Woland is aiding the Master, the Master is still unsettled by his existence. This may have two reasons. The first is the traditional place of the devil in human consciousness — it is a place traditionally of horror. The second reason is the Master realizes he is answerable to some authority for his loss of faith in his work.

As stated earlier in this thesis, the Master is often identified with some circumstances in the life of Bulgakov himself. However, Bulgakov, through the association with Pisarev's interpretation of the Brocken witch metaphor, may give his readers a hint as to another association he made for himself in *Master i Margarita*:

> Иные, боясь за свой впечатлительные нервы, действительно зажмуриваются и постепенно возвращаются к тому

> вожделенному состоянию спокойствия, которое было нарушено неосторожным прикосновением к вогнутым очкам, другие, более крепкие и в то же время более увлекающиеся, продолжают смотреть, всматриваться, громко сообщают другим отчет о том, что видят, и не обращают внимания на то, что их речи встречают к себе равнодушие и насмешки в слушателях, что изображаемые ими картины принимаются за галлюцинации, за бредни расстроенного мозга: они продолжают говорить, воодушевляясь сильнее и сильнее; их воодушевление постепенно переходит в их слушателе... (Писарев 1955, 275)

In this passage Pisarev describes an alternative reaction to the horror of the vision of the truth of humanity embodied by the Brocken witch. Pisarev describes people who can come to terms with the awful truth of humanity that they see. Furthermore, such people must loudly tell other people what they see, even though such loud explanations call forth the scorn of others. The inner strength of those who see is gradually transferred to those who listen. Such a description is uniquely suited to the satirist in general, and Bulgakov in particular. Woland is the expression of Bulgakov's artistic strength. Just as Bulgakov uses *Master i Margarita* to expose the materialism that still pervaded Soviet society through his art, so Woland used his art to expose the same thing.

4.4 Korov'ev and Korovkin

Woland is not the only character in *Master i Margarita* to have ties with Dostoevskij's works. In the *Энциклопедия Булгаковская* Boris Sokolov states:

> Коровьев-Фагот связан и с образами произведений Федора Михайловича Достоевского (1821-1881). В эпилоге "Мастера и Маргариты" среди задержанных по сходству фамилий с Коровьевым-Фаготом названы "четыре Коровкина". Здесь сразу вспоминается повесть "Село Степанчиково и его обитатели" (1859), где фигурирует некто Коровкин....
>
> Коровкин схож с булгаковским героем и разительными приметами пьянства на физиономии и в облике: "Это был невысокий, но плотный господин, лет сорока, с темными волосами и с проседью, выстриженный под гребенку, с

багровым круглым лицом, с маленькими, налитыми кровью глазами, в высоком волосяном галстухе, в пуху и в сене, и сильно лопнувшем под мышкой, в pantalon impossible (невозможных брюках (фр.) и при фуражке, засаленной до невероятности, которую он держал на отлете. Этот господин был совершенно пьян"....
А вот портрет Коровьева-Фагота: "...прозрачный гражданин престранного вида. На маленькой головке жокейский картузик, клетчатый кургузый воздушный... пиджачок... гражданин ростом в сажень, но в плечах узок, худ неимоверно, и физиономия, прошу заметить, глумливая"; "...усики у него, как куриные перья, глазки маленькие, иронические и полупьяные, а брюки клетчатые, подтянутые настолько, что видны грязные белые носки".

Здесь полный контраст физических черт - Коровкин низкий, плотный и широкоплечий, Коровьев-Фагот же высокий, худой и узкоплечий. Однако при этом совпадает не только одинаковая небрежность в одежде, но и манера речи. Коровкин обращается к гостям:" - Атанде-с... Рекомендуюсь: дитя природы... Но что я вижу? Здесь дамы... А зачем же ты не сказал мне, подлец, что у тебя здесь дамы? - прибавил он с плутовскою улыбкою смотря на дядю, - ничего? не робей!.. представимся и прекрасному полу... Прелестные дамы! - начал он, с трудом ворочая язык и завязая на каждом слове, - вы видите несчастного, который... ну, да уж и так далее... Остальное не договаривается... Музыканты! польку! ... (Соколов 1996, 245-6)

As Sokolov points out, there are many similarities between the characters of Dostoevskij and Bulgakov. The differences are indicative of the conventions of *Master i Margarita* as a whole. Bulgakov co-opts and alters conventions for his own satirical purposes. In *Master i Margarita* devils and drunkards with shadings of resonance with Dostoevskij's work are, in fact, forces of morality and enforcers of good-conduct, representatives of a higher level of meaning. Sokolov continues to enumerate the ways in which Korov'ev differs from Korovkin:

Как и герой Достоевского, Коровьев-Фагот просит выпивку "для поправления здоровья". Его речь, как и речь Коровкина, делается отрывистой и малосвязной, что характерно для пьяного. Присущую Коровкину интонацию плутовской почтительности Коровьев-Фагот сохраняет и в разговоре с Никанором Ивановичем Босым, и в обращении к дамам на сеансе черной магии в Театре Варьете.

> С другой стороны, образ Коровьева-Фагота напоминает кошмар "в брюках в крупную клетку" из сна Алексея Турбина в "Белой гвардии". Этот кошмар, в свою очередь, генетически связан с образом либерала-западника Карамзинова из романа Достоевского "Бесы" (1871-1872). К.-Ф. - это также материализовавшийся черт из разговора Ивана Карамазова с нечистым в романе "Братья Карамазовы" (1879-1880).
>
> Между Коровкиным и Коровьевым-Фаготом есть, наряду со многими чертами сходства, одно принципиальное различие. Если герой Достоевского - действительно горький пьяница и мелкий плут, способный обмануть игрой в ученость лишь крайне простодушного дядю рассказчика, то Коровьев-Фагот - это возникший из знойного московского воздуха черт (небывалая для мая жара в момент его появления - один из традиционных признаков приближения нечистой силы). Подручный Воланда только по необходимости надевает различные маски-личины: пьяницы-регента, гаера, ловкого мошенника, проныры-переводчика при знаменитом иностранце и др. Лишь в последнем полете Коровьев-Фагот становится тем, кто он есть на самом деле, мрачным демоном, рыцарем Фаготом, не хуже своего господина знающим цену людским слабостям и добродетелям. (Соколов 1996, 246)

Bulgakov referred to himself as a 'mystical writer' (Bulgakov 1990, 446). *Master i Margarita* is a unique mixture of comic satire and an underlying mystical base. While *Master i Margarita* is certainly not to be confused with theology, Bulgakov, according to his statement, was very mindful of the worldview he established in his novel. *Master i Margarita* may begin with comedy, but it ends with a metaphysical statement. That statement is on the necessity of freedom and the limits of materialism.

Woland and his suite, in their capacity as devils, naturally must uphold some traditions in order to make their departures from tradition all the more apparent. One of the tropes that Woland and his suite fulfill is the vengeful aspect of the devil, particularly of destruction through fire:

> Бегемот и Коровьев смогли проникнуть в ресторан Д. Г., назвавшись именами писателя и журналиста Ивана Ивановича Панаева (1812-1862) и критика и историка литературы Александра Михайловича Скабичевского (1838-1910), причем эти имена взаимозаменяемы: "Коровьев против фамилии "Панаев" написал "Скабичевский", а

> Бегемот против "Скабического" написал "Панаев". Оба они олицетворяли поверхностную, неглубокую критику демократического направления, не способную постичь сути явлений, но достаточно популярную среди советских литераторов в первые послереволюционные годы. Такая же формальная иерархия, как и в написанной Скабичевским "Истории новейшей литературы" (1891), присутствует в МАССОЛИТе, где писателями считают только лиц с соответствующими удостоверениями, а особо выдающимися - тех, кто входит в состав руководящих органов. Скабичевский и Панаев вполне подходят под формальные критерии обитателей Д. Г. "Литературные воспоминания" А. М. Скабичевского, последний раз переизданные в наиболее полном виде в 1928 г., накануне начала работы Булгакова над романом "Мастер и Маргарита", послужили важным источником для описания пожара Д. Г. и других пожаров в Москве (Торгсина на Смоленском рынке и дома 302-бис по Садовой). Скабичевский рассказывал о пожарной эпидемии 1862 г. в Петербурге, запечатленной также в романе Федора Достоевского (1821-1881) "Бесы" (1871-1872). (Соколов 1996, 194)

The theme of destruction by fire connects Skabičevskij and Panaev. That theme also extends to Dostoevskij, who describes the same event as Skabičevskij. Fire and demonology, as suggested by the title of Dostoevskij's novel *Besy*, are correlated in popular consciousness. The fire described in *Master i Margarita* destroys not only Apartment No. 50, the store and the Griboedov house, but also, on the metaphorical level, the superficial *publicistika* of Skabičevskij and Panaev. *Master i Margarita* in many ways is a call for authenticity in human actions. That call is embodied by the novel's relation to Pisarev's interpretation of Heine's metaphor of the Brocken witch. Skabičevskij and Panaev have failed in their calling as literary observers of the political process, whereas Bulgakov the satirist has succeeded, calling upon himself the scorn of others. It is clear that Bulgakov originally had in mind a greater role for his references to Skabičevskij:

> Еще больше деталей московских пожаров взято Булгаковым у Скабичевского. Воланд, подобно автору "Литературных воспоминаний", использовал как синонимы слова "толпа" и "чернь" в ранней редакции "Мастера и Маргариты", когда втолковывал Берлиозу и Бездомному, что "толпа - во все времена толпа, чернь..." В варианте 1931 г. Иван Бездомный,

> оказавшись в психиатрической лечебнице (тогда он именовался то Покинутым, то Безродным), "пророчески" громко сказал:
> - Ну, пусть погибнет красная столица, я в лето от Рождества Христова 1943-е все сделал, чтобы спасти ее! Но... но победил ты меня, сын гибели, и заточил меня, спасителя...
> Он поднялся и вытянул руки, и глаза его стали мутны и неземной красоты.
> - И увижу ее в огне пожаров, - продолжал Иван, - в дыму увижу безумных, бегущих по Бульварному кольцу..." (Соколов 1996, 197)

Bulgakov's borrowings from Skabičevskij serve to intensify the meaning of Korov'ev and Begemot's expedition. Sokolov's observation about Ivan Bezdomnyj's earlier speech demonstrates how Woland's suite fulfills a Biblical function, in harmony with the supposed intentions of God, and how these events are juxtaposed with their causes, among them the lack of honesty and truth.

As I have demonstrated above, Bulgakov weaves a complex web of associations with other authors. These connections can be used to better understand the nature of the characters and events in *Master i Margarita*. Bulgakov conducts a covert dialogue with the reader, who must uncover the meaning of his references and how to apply them to the novel. There is a precedent in *Master i Margarita* for such covert dialogue:

> Расписываясь как "Панаев" и "Скабичевский", Коровьев-Фагот и Бегемот напоминают о знаменитых петербургских пожарах, описания которых связаны с этими фамилиями, однако угрожающему предупреждению внял только проницательный Арчибальд Арчибальдович. (Соколов 1996, 198)

In the same way that the reader must understand the subtext of *Master i Margarita* to understand what actions Korov'ev and Begemot will take, so Arčibal'd Arčibal'dovič understands the ramifications of not allowing Korov'ev and Begemot entrance to the Griboedov house. However, he does not sufficiently understand the moral order of *Master i Margarita* to realize that the building will be destroyed anyway because of it's nature, and that Korov'ev and Begemot cannot be bribed with good food. Arčibal'd

Arčibal'dovič's mistake in judgment provides an opportunity for the reader to understand the reasons for the actions of Woland's suite. The process of conducting a subtext that the reader must interpret to better understand the world of the novel is a process that continues throughout the work, as I have illustrated in this chapter through the web of references and allusions that Bulgakov makes.

In the part of the conversations of both Dostoevskij's and Bulgakov's devils concerning rheumatism, both devils claim to ease their pain using folk remedies. The devil conversing with Ivan Karamazov states:

> Что будешь делать? Прибегнул к народным средствам, один немец-доктор посоветовал в бане на полке медом с солью натереться. Я, единственно чтобы только в баню лишний раз сходить, пошел: выпачкался весь, и никакой пользы. С отчаяния графу Маттеи в Милан написал: прислал книгу и капли, бог с ним. И вообрази: мальц-экстракт Гоффа помог! Купил нечаянно, выпил полторы стеклянки, и хоть танцовать, всё как рукой сняло. Непременно положил ему "спасибо" в газетах напечатать, чувство благодарности заговорило, и вот вообрази, тут уже другая история пошла: ни в одной-то редакции не принимают! "Ретроградно очень будет, говорят, никто не поверит, le diable n'existe point. Вы, советуют, напечатайте анонимно". Ну какое же "спасибо", если анонимно. Смеюсь с конторщиками: "это в бога, говорю, в наш век ретроградно верить, а ведь я чорт, в меня можно". — "Понимаем, говорят, кто же в чорта не верит, а всё-таки нельзя, направлению повредить может. Разве в виде шутки?" Ну в шутку-то, подумал, будет неостроумно. Так и не напечатали. И веришь ли, у меня даже на сердце это осталось. Самые лучшие чувства мои, как, например, благодарность, мне формально запрещены единственно социальным моим положением. (Достоевский 1963, 352)

Within this monologue the devil correlates his existence with existence or non-existence, of both himself and God. Human ailment is transferred to the question of the existence of God and the devil and, by implication, the divinity of man. It is ironic that the devil asks human beings for advice on easing the pain, and even mentions 'consulting with a German doctor.' This may be an oblique reference to Faust, which had such influence on literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The tone and features of the conversation in general, is echoed by Woland:

> Вздор! Лет через триста это пройдет. Мне посоветовали множество лекарств, но я по старинке придерживаюсь бабушкиных средств. Поразительные травы оставила в наследство поганая старушка, моя бабушка! (Булгаков 1990, 251)

When Woland mentions his own grandmother he creates a sense of irony. It runs counter to tradition that the devil should have a grandmother. Whether or not the statement can be interpreted in the literal sense is beside the point. The subtext of this statement implies Woland's connection with humanity, similar to that of Dostoevskij's devil, as mentioned above. Both authors bring their philosophical issues from the realm of the abstract into the realm of the immediate through the dialogue of their devils.

Within dialogue, Dostoevskij's devil often uses irony. One of the ways in which he generates irony is through colloquialisms that have metaphysical connotations, involving invocation of God or devil. In his conversation with Ivan Karamazov, the devil says in various places "Бог с ним" (352), "Боже меня убереги" (352), "ей-богу" (353), "до черточки" (355). Woland also uses similar expressions along the same lines, especially in Chapter One. The expressions are even more significant in that context because Woland's identity is not yet fully established. The colloquial expressions are hints in the subtext as to Woland's identity. Colloquial expressions with the world "черт" are used five times in Chapter One, both by Woland and by Berlioz and Bezdomnyj. The fact that Berlioz and Bezdomnyj employ such expressions suggests that the hints are being made from the authorial level.

Even if Woland were intentionally trying to lead the other characters towards an understanding of his identity, it would be necessary for the other to compel Berlioz and Bezdomnyj to use such expressions to provide suggestions to the reader. The colloquial expressions invoking God and the devil are an important functional part of the dialogue in both novels.

The philosophical questions that both novels raise are illustrated in a common way. When describing the questions of the existence of God and the devil, Bulgakov's and Dostoevskij's devils both bring up the theme of the philosopher. This theme is connected to Faust, who was a philosopher and

sought to understand God and control the infernal forces. This common thread is used to illustrate that human beings are not as powerful or wise as they might think. In Faust's case this is a commentary on the Enlightenment rationality. In Dostoevskij's case it is a commentary on Nineteenth-century materialism. In Bulgakov's case it is a commentary on Marxist-Leninist communism, which developed from Nineteenth-century materialism. Dostoevskij's devil says:

> Был дескать здесь у вас на земле один такой мыслитель и философ, "всё отвергал, законы, совесть, веру", а главное — будущую жизнь. Помер, думал, что прямо во мрак и смерть, ан перед ним — будущая жизнь. Изумился и вознегодовал: "Это, говорит, противоречит моим убеждениям". Вот его за это и присудили... то есть, видишь, ты меня извини, я ведь передаю сам, что слышал, это только легенда... присудили, видишь, его, чтобы прошел во мраке квадрилион километров (у нас ведь теперь на километры), и когда кончит этот квадрилион, то тогда ему отворят райские двери и всё простят... (Достоевский 1963, 354)

Dostoevskij's devil's story is analogous to the one Woland tells Berlioz and Bezdomnyj when they first meet:

> — Браво! — вскричал иностранец, — браво! Вы полностью повторили мысль беспокойного старика Иммануила по этому поводу. Но вот курьез: он начисто разрушил все пять доказательств, а затем, как бы в насмешку над самим собою, соорудил собственное шестое доказательство!
>
> — Доказательство Канта, — тонко улыбнувшись, возразил образованный редактор, — также неубедительно. И недаром Шиллер говорил, что кантовские рассуждения по этому вопросу могут удовлетворить только рабов, а Штраус просто смеялся над этим доказательством.
>
> Берлиоз говорил, а сам в это время думал: "Но, все-таки, кто же он такой? И почему так хорошо говорит по-русски?"
>
> — Взять бы этого Канта, да за такие доказательства года на три в Соловки! — совершенно неожиданно бухнул Иван Николаевич.
>
> — Иван! — сконфузившись, шепнул Берлиоз.
>
> Но предложение отправить Канта в Соловки не только не поразило иностранца, но даже привело в восторг.
>
> — Именно, именно, — закричал он, и левый зеленый глаз его, обращенный к Берлиозу, засверкал, — ему там самое место! Ведь говорил я ему тогда за завтраком: "Вы,

> профессор, воля ваша, что-то нескладное придумали! Оно, может, и умно, но больно непонятно. Над вами потешаться будут".
>
> Берлиоз выпучил глаза. "За завтраком... Канту?.. Что это он плетет?" — подумал он.
>
> — Но, — продолжал иноземец, не смущаясь изумлением Берлиоза и обращаясь к поэту, — отправить его в Соловки невозможно по той причине, что он уже с лишком сто лет пребывает в местах значительно более отдаленных, чем Соловки, и извлечь его оттуда никоим образом нельзя, уверяю вас! (Булгаков 1990, 13-4)

The similarities of the *fabula* of the two stories are very close. The story Dostoevskij's devil tells can also be compared to the fate of Berlioz at Satan's Ball, in which Woland points out that each person is rewarded according to their faith. This link can be extended to the Master's case, in which he is judged because he did not have enough faith in his work, and also in Margarita. The difference between the *fabula* of Dostoevskij and Bulgakov is that Dostoevskij's philosopher reaches paradise after traveling through purgatory. In *Master i Margarita* Kant does not reach paradise. However, from what the reader sees at the end of the novel when Margarita and the Master enter Woland's realm, it is not necessarily a place of torture, but can be very pleasant as well. It is Berlioz, for his denial of a higher power, who receives the worst sentence — nonexistence.

4.5 Conclusion to the Chapter

The architecture of *Master i Margarita* is complex and multi-layered. In order to more fully grasp the significance of the work it is necessary for the reader to become acquainted with how the dialogue is constructed and with the subtext of the novel.

The structure of the dialogue is important because it contains information on the attitude of the author to the narrator and the characters, of the narrator to other characters, and of the characters to each other. Mixail Baxtin devoted attention to Dostoevskij's dialogue. He found that some characters would repeat the interior monologue of another interlocutor and incorporate that monologue into their dialogue with that interlocutor. In this chapter I explained Baxtin's analysis of Alëša Karamazov's dialogue with

Ivan Karamazov, as well as Ivan Karamazov's dialogue with the devil. In both analysis Baxtin points out that both Alëša and the devil reproduce Ivan's interior monologue. In contrast Woland is able to read and understand the thoughts and feelings of the people he meets, even though no one, not even the narrator, can see into his mind. Although Woland can read thoughts, he does not reproduce another interlocutor's internal monologue in any dialogue he conducts. For that reason it must be concluded that *Master i Margarita* is not a polyphonic novel. The thrust of *Master i Margarita* is not to more or less equally represent different points of view, but to illustrate one point of view that in the context of the novel is privileged. That point of view is a rejection of Materialism and Communism, as well as a call for freedom from censorship for literature.

The subtext of the novel is created by innuendos and allusions to other texts inserted by the author. Woland is usually the agent of expression for the subtext. The themes of his dialogue with other characters comment upon other works of literature in relation both to *Master i Margarita* as well as the world in which Bulgakov lived. One of the features of the subtext included in *Master i Margarita* is an invitation to compare Woland's conversations with the conversation of Ivan Karamazov and the devil in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*. Both devils argue against a purely materialistic worldview. Woland, however, speaks from a position of authority. No monologues are allowed to effectively complete with his own. Dostoevskij's devil, however, does not speak from a position of such authority. The conversation in that context is centered more upon human beings. In *Brat'ja Karamazovy* the devil can only debate with Ivan Karamazov, whereas in *Master i Margarita* the devil intercedes for humanity, bringing an absolute moral standard.

5. Conclusion

The features of the narration can be especially telling in a text. A study of these elements is especially important in a work such as *Master i Margarita*. The narrator in *Master i Margarita* is not reliable, authoritative or omniscient. At times the narrator is naïve. The narrator, in some places, expresses subjective judgments, which often turn out to be incorrect. Woland is the most authoritative voice in the entire novel, even more authoritative than that of the narrator. In novels the narrator is traditionally the most reliable. Woland holds a unique position in the novel: he is the devil. However, he is not a force of evil but rather a force that examines humanity and punishes evil. This quality is reflected in the position he holds in the dialogue. Woland's dialogue is always composed of different layers: text and subtext. In this work I have examined both layers of the dialogue and analyzed the properties of both.

In the overt text each character, including the narrator, occupies a unique position. The field of valuation that surrounds a character determines the position. The values of the narrator are markedly different from the apparent values of the author. The author's values can be determined by examining the representation of each character, including the narrator, from the authorial level. When the author's values significantly differ from those expressed by the narrator the author makes irony towards the narrator visible. The author focuses that irony through Woland, who is a vehicle of satire of both the narrator and the other characters.

The formal attributes of the narrator change throughout the novel. When the narrator describes the interaction between Woland, Berlioz and Bezdomnyj in Chapter One, the narrator often intervenes from the viewpoint of Berlioz and Bezdomnyj, making observations that they themselves might make, and echoing those observations that they do make. This narrator uses many colloquial expressions and engages in personal observations, which presents strong formal characteristics of his existence. These formal characteristics completely disappear in Chapter Two. Woland narrates Chapter Two. Judging from the complete absence of formal characteristics of

existence, it can be said that the narrator does not exist in Chapter Two. Instead, Woland freely carries on his own narration. Woland's absolute power over the other characters in the novel corresponds to his power over the narrator. Woland can preempt the narrator at will when it suits his purposes.

According to M. M. Baxtin's formulation, the narrative structure of a novel can be visualized as a series of spheres. In Dostoevskij's works, according to Baxtin, the greatest circle is that of the author-reader. It encompasses the sphere of the narrator, which in turn encompasses the spheres of the characters that interact among themselves. The location and volume of the spheres is determined using the information displayed by the characters and narrator. All possible information is available to the author. Most information is available to the narrator, who observes and relates all action in the text. The characters possess information in different measures.

In *Master i Margarita* the structure is different. The author possesses all possible information. Woland, however, possess the next greatest amount of information. The spheres of the narrator and the other characters are subordinated to those of the author and Woland. In terms of the other characters the narrator has no more access to information than does Margarita, and quite possibly has less.

In Chapter Three the narrator, simultaneously with Ivan Bezdomnyj, strives to understand the significance of the events that have transpired. The author displays the narrator's growth along with that of the other characters in relation to Woland.

Chapter 22 is of great importance in the plot of the novel because that is where the central events come together and where the author finally decides to provide a description of who Woland really is. The formal characteristics of the narrator's existence are significantly reduced here. Instead, the dialogue between Woland and Margarita, with a parallel dialogue with Begemot, are given full attention. Woland always occupies a strong position and the narrator a weak one. Woland apparently allows the narrator

to assert himself when convenient for Woland, but prevents him from self-assertion when necessary. Chapters 24 and 29 continue this pattern.

At the same time the overt text plays out during the novel, there is also a prominent and important subtext that permeates the text. The subtext contains themes that comment upon Woland's nature and his functions. Specifically, the subtext reveals the process of observation, testing and judgment that Woland conducts. Margarita learns the rules of the subtext, albeit awkwardly at times, and uses it to her advantage and that of the Master. The narrator, however, never visibly learns of the subtext.

The combination of overt text and subtext forms a coherent structure in the novel. At the very head of this structure is the author. The next highest is Woland, followed by Margarita and then the rest of the characters, the narrator included.

The structure of a novel includes from whose point of view the action is narrated, whom does the narrator follow, how is the *sjužet* constructed, how time and space are described. My study of the first three chapters focused on the narrator, whereas my study of the later chapters focused on the structure of the novel in relation to Baxtin's theories. I found similarities and differences relative to Dostoevskij's novels as seen by Baxtin.

Woland has access to the interior monologues of the other characters, similar to some characters in Dostoevskij's novels. However, in contrast, Woland is not an equal participant in dialogue with the other characters. Rather, he occupies a privileged position in which he breaks down the arguments of those who oppose his point of view, such as Berlioz, and instructs other interlocutors to follow his conventions using the subtext, such as Margarita. In this way the structure of the dialogue mirrors the structure of the novel, in which Woland holds the highest position.

The dialogue in *Master i Margarita* presents a unique opportunity for gaining the necessary information outside of the narrator's sphere of influence. Although the narrators and narrative styles may change and contradict one another, the dialogue is the consistent indicator of the character's thoughts and reactions.

Master i Margarita is not a polyphonic novel even though it does have some of the characteristics of one. No character has access to Woland's interior monologue or those of the members of the suite, even though Woland has access to the interior monologues of the other characters. This difference in abilities to access interior monologue is indicative of the strong, privileged position Woland holds in the framework of the novel. Woland never engages in dialogue as an equal partner, rather he is a strong interlocutor. His statements are authoritative, with the full force of the author's probable intention behind them. Interlocutors in Dostoevskij's works, according to Baxtin, are more or less equal. In *Master i Margarita* Woland is the holder of absolute truth, and as such cannot be equal to his interlocutors. Woland's position underlies a clear moral polarization of the novel.

Throughout the novel Woland engages characters in overt Socratic dialogue. The most prominent Socratic dialogue is with Berlioz and Bezdomnyj in Chapter One. Additionally, there is a prominent subtext that runs throughout the novel. Woland conducts and manages the subtext. It is a Hermetic dialogue with the reader as well as with Margarita. The reader observes how Margarita learns the rules of the subtext and uses it for her benefit. Woland as an interlocutor in both forms of dialogue, overt and covert, provides the reader with the tools to interpret the novel. Like Margarita, the reader must learn the subtext from Woland.

By comparing Bulgakov's strategies of narration and depiction as well as the application of Baxtin's theories to different subjects, the researcher can better understand the unifying force that Woland provides in *Master i Margarita* and provide a framework to interpret the meaning of this complex text.

In constructing the dialogue of *Master i Margarita* Bulgakov creates resonance with other works of literature using a complex subtext of references and allusions. One of the major references that Bulgakov makes is to Dostoevskij. The first way Bulgakov alludes to Dostoevskij is by endowing Woland with traits similar to that of the devil in *Bratja*

Karamazovy. The devils conduct dialogue with their respective interlocutors in ways that are similar in some ways but not identical.

The second way that Bulgakov creates resonance with Dostoevskij is by overt and covert references to Dostevskij. The overt reference comes when Korov'ev mentions Dostoevskij's name. The covert references come in allusions to events that Dostoevskij wrote about and that were also described by Dostoevskij's contemporaries. The allusions also include Woland's rheumatism, Pisarev and the theme of the Brocken witch and Korovkin's similarity with Korov'ev.

Like the devil in *Bratja Karamazovy*, Woland and his suite are the quintessential Other, which is necessary for dialogue. The differences as the Other is illuminated by differences in narrative strategy. Dostoevskij treats his devil with irony, whereas Bulgakov never treats Woland with irony. Woland is more reliable and knowledgeable than the narrator of *Master i Margarita*. The strategies of discourse are also different. Bulgakov employs a multi-layered discourse that is absent in Dostoevskij's work.

Bulgakov's novel *Master i Margarita* is an excusite and complex construction encompassing many traditions and modes of communication. The center of meaning is located at Woland, who through his narration and dialogue carries Bulgakov's dialogue with the reader. Woland is the unifying element of the novel, giving the work structure and direction. *Master i Margarita* deals with the themes of humanity's place in the universe and with the moral decisions each human being must make. It is Woland who organizes and conducts the examination these issues through unique strategies of narration and dialogue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Бахтин, Михаил. 1963. *Проблемы поэтики Достоевского*. Москва: Советский писатель,

———. 1986. «Автор и герой в эстетической деятельности». *Литературно-критические статьи*. Ред. С. Г. Бочаров и В. В. Кожинов. Москва: Худ. Лит.

Бердяев, Николай. 1955. *Истоки и смысл русского коммунизма*. Париж: YMCA Press.

Булгаков, М. А. 1990. *Мастер и Маргарита. Собрание сочинений в пяти томах*. Том 5. Москва: Художественная литература, 7-384.

Винокур, Г. О. и др. 1935. *Толковый словарь русского языка*. Москва: Государственный институт «Советская энциклопедия».

Достоевский, Ф. М. 1963. *Братья Карамазовы*. Том 2. Москва: ГИХЛ. 344-62.

Казакова, Светлана. 2001. «Власть и сила: Роман Михаила Булгакова *Мастер и Маргарита*». *Russian, Croatian and Serbian, Czech and Slovak, Polish Literature* 49.7:1-23.

Киселева, Л. Ф. 1991. «Диалог добра и зла в романе Михаила Булгакова <Мастер и Маргарита>». *Филологические науки* 6:3-11.

Писарев, Д. И. 1955. «Статьи и рецензии 1859-1862 гг.» *Собрание сочинений в четырех томах*. Том 1. Москва: ГИХЛ. 3-356.

Пушкин, А. С. 1960. «Царь видел пред собою...» *Собрание сочинений в десяти томах*. Том 3. Москва: ГИХЛ. 420.

Соколов, Борис. 1996. *Энциклопедия Булгаковская*. Москва: Локис-Миф.

Фасмер, М. 1973. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Том 4. Москва: Прогресс. 415.

Чудакова, М. О. 1988. *Жизнеописание Михаила Булгакова*. Москва: Книга.

Arenberg, Carol. 1982. "Mythic and daimonic paradigms in Bulgakov's *Master i Margarita*." *Essays in Literature* 9.1:107-25.

Baker, Harold D. 1998. "Socratic, Hermetic and internally convincing dialogue: Types of interlocution in Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*." *The Russian Review* 57.1:53-71.

———. 2001. "Voland's seventh proof: The event in Bulgakov's *Master i Margarita*." *Russian, Croatian and Serbian, Czech and Slovak, Polish Literature* 49.1:69-85.

Curtis, J. A. E and Colin Wright. 1981. "A Partial check-list of Bulgakov materials in Soviet archives." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 15.2-3:440-56.

Curtis, J. A. E. 1987. *Bulgakov's last decade: The writer as hero*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Haber, Edythe C. 1975. "The mythic structure of Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*." *Russian Review* 34.4:382-409.

———. 1993. "Dwellings and devils in early Bulgakov." *Slavic and East European Journal* 37:326-38.

Krasnov, Vladislav. 1987. "Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* in light of Baxtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*." *Russian Language Journal* 41.138-9:95-113.

Lowe, David. 1996. "Gounod's *Faust* and Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*." *The Russian Review* 55:279-86.

Milne, Lesley. 1977. The Master and Margarita — *A comedy of victory*. Birmingham: The Department of Russian Language and Literature, University of Birmingham.

Proffer, Ellendea. 1984. *Bulgakov: Life and work*. Ann Arbor: Ardis.

Stenbrock-Fermor, Elizabeth. 1969. "Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* and Goethe's *Faust*." *Slavic and East European Journal* 13.3:309-25.

Tumanov, Vladimir. 1989. "Diabolus ex Machina: Bulgakov's Modernist devil." *Scando-Slavica* 35:49-61.

Taranovski Johnson, Vida. 1981. "The thematic function of the narrator in *The Master and Margarita*. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 15:271-86.

Thompson, Stith. 1955. *Motif-index of folk-literature*. 6 vols. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Weeks, Laura D., ed. 1996. *The Master and Margarita: A critical companion*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP.

Wright, Colin A. 1973. "Satan in Moscow: An approach to Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*." *PMLA* 88:1164-5.

———. 1981. "Mikhail Bulgakov's developing world view." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 15.2-3:151-66.